Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-183
Friday
22 September 1989

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-183 22 September 1989

CONTENTS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Cheney Cited on Prospects for Strategic Arms Treaty *[TASS]* 1
NATO Offers New Arms Proposals at Vienna Talks *[TASS]* 1
General Denies NATO Statement on Tank Withdrawal *[TASS]* 1
PRAVDA Discusses Readers' Views on Disarmament *[17 Sep]* 2

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Shevardnadze Meets With Bush, Heads to Wyoming 3
Meets Bush at White House *[TASS]* 3
Comments on Talks With Bush *[TASS]* 3
Speaks About Perestroyka, Reforms *[TASS]* 4
Shevardnadze, Baker Arrive in Wyoming for Talks *[TASS]* 4
Shevardnadze Issues Arrival Statement *[TASS]* 5
Shevardnadze's Upcoming Talks in U.S. Viewed *[Zholkver on Moscow Radio]* 5
U.S. 'Optimism' Before Visit, Talks Cited *[IZVESTIYA 22 Sep]* 6
Spokesman Comments on U.S. Exercises in Pacific *[TASS]* 6

China

Prospects for Soviet-Chinese Ties Examined *[Nikolayev on Moscow International]* 7
PRC-USSR Role in Regional Conflicts Viewed *[Volskiy on Moscow International]* 7
Li Peng Comments on USSR-China Cooperation *[TASS]* 8
Qian Qichen on PRC Foreign Policy Achievements *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 16 Sep]* 8

Southeast Asia & Pacific

TASS on Vietnamese Withdrawal From Cambodia 8
Burmese Leadership Facing Foreign Criticism *[Vladimirov on Moscow International]* 9
Burma After 1 Year of Military Rule *[Vladimirov on Moscow International]* 9
Leaders Greet Indonesia's Suharto on National Day *[Moscow International]* 10

Near East & South Asia

Moiseyev Visits Kabul, Meets With Najibullah *[TASS]* 11
Afghan Foreign Minister Stops Over in Moscow *[IZVESTIYA 19 Sep]* 11
Vorontsov, Pakistan Envoy Discuss Afghanistan *[TASS]* 11
Vorontsov Receives New Iraqi Ambassador *[TASS]* 11
Indian Finance Minister Interviewed on Visit *[Moscow TV]* 11

Sub-Saharan Africa

South Africa Role in Namibian Independence Viewed *[Patovskiy on Moscow International]* ... 11
Groundwork for Internal South Africa Talks Viewed *[Tsirolov on Moscow International]* 12
Anxiety Expressed Over Southwest Africa Situation *[Moscow International]* 13
Southwestern African Peace Process Examined *[Moscow International]* 13
Military Delegation Arrives in Mozambique 14

East Europe

Medvedev Arrives in East Berlin for Conference *[TASS]* 14
Hungarian Communists, Opposition Complete Talks *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 20 Sep]* 14
Gallup Polls Hungarians' Political Inclinations *[PRAVDA 17 Sep]* 14
Budapest Radio Queries Pamyat Member Vasilyev 15
CSSR's Jakes Addresses Regional Party Chiefs *[PRAVDA 17 Sep]* 16
CSSR-Albania Ties, USSR Stance Contrasted *[IZVESTIYA 15 Sep]* 16
CPSU Group Studies Romanian Agricultural Policy *[PRAVDA 17 Sep]* 17

West Europe

Further on Soviet Official's Disappearance in Rome *[Rome LA REPUBBLICA 21 Sep]* 17
Gorbachev November Visit to Italy Confirmed *[Milan L'UNITA 14 Sep]* 17
Thatcher Comments on Soviet Reforms in Tokyo Talk 17
Lauds 'Gorbachev's Valiance' *[TASS]* 17
Calls Gorbachev's Policies 'Brave' *[TASS]* 18
Speaks on Baltic Independence *[Moscow International]* 18
Soviet-UK Ties Experts View Forthcoming Summit *[Moscow International]* 19
France's Marchais Arrives in Moscow; Met by Falin *[TASS]* 20

Latin America & Caribbean

Omelichev Reaffirms End of Nicaraguan Arms Link *[TASS]* 20
U.S. 'Ready To Send' Military Adivsers in Drug War *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 12 Sep]* 20
Commentator Views U.S. Aid to El Salvador *[Levchenko on Moscow International]* 20
Salvadoran President Deviates From Agreements *[TASS]* 21
Radio Disputes 'Panamanian Resistance' Interview *[Moscow Radio Peace and Progress]* 21

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

PRAVDA Account of 19 Sep CPSU Plenum Debate *[21 Sep]* 23
More 20 Sep Party Plenum Speeches Reported 59
Ligachev Defends Perestroyka *[TASS]* 59
Yazov on Army Support for Party Policy *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 22 Sep]* 61
Plenum Resolution on Investigation of Ligachev *[TASS]* 63
Biographies of New Central Committee Secretaries 63
Andrey Girenko *[TASS]* 63
Yuriy Manayenkov *[TASS]* 64
Yegor Stroyev *[TASS]* 64
Gumer Usmanov *[TASS]* 64
Supreme Soviet Deputies Begin Registering *[Moscow International]* 64
Gorbachev Chairs Supreme Soviet Presidium Session *[TASS]* 64
Vologzhin Assesses CPSU Plenum *[TASS]* 65
Committees, Commissions Discuss Plan, Budget *[IZVESTIYA 20 Sep]* 66
Gorbachev Meets With Farm Workers *[Moscow Radio]* 67
Interview With Lithuania's Brazauskas Reported *[Vilnius Radio]* 67
Lithuanian Party Backs Sovereign Lithuanian State *[Vilnius International]* 68
Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Passes Resolution *[Vilnius International]* 69
New Lithuanian Sajudis Newspaper Published *[Vilnius Radio]* 69
Ryzhkov Visits Novgorod District 21 Sep *[Moscow Radio]* 69
Strikers Demand Right To Leave Contaminated Zone *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 16 Sep]* 70
Moldavian Strike Committee Member Interviewed *[Moscow TV]* 70
Armenian Supreme Soviet Appeals for Blockade End *[Moscow International]* 71
Uzbekistan's KGB Arrests Drug Smugglers *[TASS]* 71
Selected Speeches From AUCCTU Plenum Reported *[TRUD 7 Sep]* 71

Economic

Report of 1985-88 Budget 'Secrets' Published
[Yuryev in PRAVITELSTVENNYY VESTNIK No 18] 83
Three Free Economic Zones To Be Established *[Moscow Radio]* 85

Agricultural

More on Nikonov Visit to Vladimir Oblast *[PRAVDA 15 Sep]* 85
Agricultural Figures Reported for 15-21 Sep 86

Military

Navy Training Ship Begins Visit to Naples 19 Sep *[TASS]* 87
Varennikov Addresses Conference on Training *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 15 Sep]* 87
Draft Dodger Convicted, Sentenced to Forced Labor *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 15 Sep]* 87
Victims of Uzbekistsan Helicopter Crash Identified *[Moscow Radio]* 87

Cheney Cited on Prospects for Strategic Arms Treaty

LD2209103689 Moscow TASS in English 1025 GMT 22 Sep 89

[Text] San Francisco September 22 TASS—By TASS correspondent Andrey Sidorin:

The major transformations in the Soviet Union influence the development of Soviet-American relations and, as a consequence, U.S. defence policy, U.S. Defence Secretary Richard Cheney said at the California Commonwealth Club.

The Bush Administration, he said, supports Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev's policy of reforms and wishes it success since this leads to relaxation of tension and the military threat to the United States, Cheney stressed.

There are appreciable changes in Soviet-American relations. The USSR has unilaterally reduced its armed forces in Europe. Through NATO and Warsaw Treaty channels the U.S. is now conducting negotiations on conventional armed forces on the European continent. If they are a success, there will be a possibility to consider cuts in tactical nuclear weapons in Europe.

Cheney said that the Soviet Union has, as before, powerful strategic forces and remains the main military opponent of the United States. The United States should therefore maintain its military might, and also the might and unity of the NATO bloc, he said. Nuclear forces will play a major role in the American "deterrence" policy in the future, too, he stressed.

Cheney called for the continuation of major programmes to develop new systems of strategic weapons and underlined that the U.S. Administration attached, as before, priority significance to "The Strategic Defence Initiative".

Cheney attacked U.S. congressmen who insist on curtailing the star wars programme and cutting allocations for the Pentagon's other strategic plans. If the draft military budget, to be passed by the Congress, does not allocate sufficient funds to develop our strategic forces, we shall insist that President Bush veto it, Cheney said. He meanwhile admitted that the Administration is being criticised in Congress for its insufficiently acute stand at the Geneva negotiations to draw up a treaty on cuts in strategic offensive armaments.

When TASS asked for his views about the prospects for the treaty, Cheney said that they are very good. It is necessary to resolve many complex questions, which, specifically, concern ground and sea-based nuclear cruise missiles and also elaboration of methods of verification and control in setting restrictions on these weapons. Methods to rely on the existing experience of verification and control over the observation of the INF treaty should be tried out before the signing of a treaty on strategic armaments. We are fully determined to make headway in solution of these problems, Cheney said.

Cheney said he believed that an agreement on the reduction of strategic offensive armaments would be signed during President Bush's first term in office.

NATO Offers New Arms Proposals at Vienna Talks

LD2109154189 Moscow TASS in English 1516 GMT 21 Sep 89

[Text] Vienna September 21 TASS—By TASS correspondent Vladimir Smelov:

NATO countries made additional proposals concerning exchanges of information, verification and stabilisation measures at another full-scale session of the talks on conventional armed forces in Europe in Vienna's Hofburg Palace today.

They had promised to table the proposals a fortnight before, but failed to do so then because of continuing disagreements (some provisions were opposed, in particular, by Greece).

APA news agency reported, quoting diplomatic circles, that the latest proposals follow a compromise worked out during consultations between Western partners in Brussels.

But the contentious issue of inspections remains open and the news agency said that further talks between NATO allies will be needed to resolve it.

According to the newspaper STANDARD, NATO members also differ on arrangements to monitor the production of heavy weapons in Eastern and Western Europe and on what should be done to arms subject to reductions.

General Denies NATO Statement on Tank Withdrawal

LD2109113589 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1049 GMT 21 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow, 21 Sep (TASS)—"In 1989 not a single new tank reached Soviet troops situated on the territory of Hungary, the GDR, Poland, and the CSSR", stated Lieutenant General Fr:nts Markovskiy, deputy chief of a main directorate of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces. In an interview with a TASS correspondent he denied allegations by General Galvin, commander in chief of NATO allied armed forces in Europe, that the Soviet Union, after purportedly withdrawing part of its tanks from Central Europe, is at the same time replacing them there with new ones.

As General Markovskiy noted, since the Soviet Union undertook the obligation to unilaterally reduce the number of its tanks in Central Europe by 1991 by 5,300 units, 2,714 tanks have already been withdrawn this year. These include 1,988 from the GDR and 447 from the Hungarian People's Republic. According to the general, the remaining tanks will be withdrawn in 1990. "Cuts in the number of Soviet troops on the territories of

allied countries are being made in conditions of openness and glasnost," Gen Markovskiy noted in conclusion.

PRAVDA Discusses Readers' Views on Disarmament

PM2109085189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
17 Sep 89 Second Edition p 4

[K. Sorokin "Dialogue" feature: "Toward Reasonable Sufficiency"; first paragraph is reader's letter]

[Text] "We must not unilaterally reduce our arms below the level of inflicting sure damage [zavedomoye porazheniye] for otherwise the adversary would not miss the opportunity of a sure victory [zavedomaya pobeda]." N.Ya. Artemchuk, Zhitomir.

Such is the basic idea expressed in the overwhelming majority of responses to I. Volodina's letter published in "Dialogue" under the heading "Do not Extinguish the Spark of Hope." I will recall that I. Volodina advocated the USSR's complete unilateral disarmament and "the sooner, the better."

There were a great many responses to I. Volodina's letter and this indicates that readers do not show indifference to questions connected with the problems of limiting and reducing arms and implementing the "new thinking."

The editorial mail testifies to the fact that the Soviet Union's new foreign policy course enjoys very broad support. In the opinion of the readership, improving relations and developing contacts with western countries, extending the process of disarmament, the USSR's unilateral measures to reduce its Armed Forces, and other steps which accord with our defensive military doctrine—all these are measures in the right direction.

But does this mean that the USSR has got to be the sole participant in the progress of disarmament? I think that our readers are absolutely right: Disarmament is a two-way street.

The world situation has improved significantly in the past few years. The Western countries have also made an important contribution to this. Under the influence of the Soviet Union's example, the previous confrontational thinking over there is gradually giving way to a realization of the fact that mankind has come up against problems of a global scale and that these can only be solved by concerted effort.

But if the West's policy is noted for its inconsistency, its military activity is marked by its continuity. The point is that the main trends in NATO's armed forces operational development and combat training were determined back in the late seventies and early eighties. And there has been no particular change here. The recent testing in the United States of the new B-2 strategic bomber in particular points to this. Perhaps the only real exception to the general trend is the Treaty on Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles.

As readers—in particular S. Yakubovskiy from Novaya Kakhovka—rightly believe, the threat to the security of our country has not disappeared. It is true that now there is not such a danger of war breaking out as there was even a few years ago. This is a result of the improvement in the global political climate, the coordination of a package of measures designed to prevent accidental conflict, and the preservation of equality of strength between the USSR and the United States, and between NATO and the Warsaw Pact.

The latter must be specially mentioned. It is hard to disagree with the opinion of G. Shurygin from Kazan: "It is thanks to our army that there has been no war for so many years." Indeed, if you are weak, people will not talk to you, they will just beat you. It is not by chance that at the end of the sixties, when approximate strategic balance between the countries had been achieved, the United States for the first time entered into regular dialogue with the USSR on questions of disarmament. (It will be recalled that it was at that time precisely that talks on strategic arms began). It is another matter that when trying to equalize the levels of security in the USSR and the United States, we got carried away with military methods and forgot about political ones. Now we are going back to them. It is important not to lurch—unilaterally—too hastily in the opposite direction.

United States & Canada

Shevardnadze Meets With Bush, Heads to Wyoming

Meets Bush at White House

LD2109184189 Moscow TASS in English 1826 GMT 21 Sep 89

[Text] Washington September 21 TASS—U.S. President George Bush opened a meeting with visiting Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze in the White House.

Their discussion is dealing with key international problems and the whole gamut of issues on the agenda in Soviet-American relations, in particular arms control and reduction, regional, bilateral, transnational and humanitarian issues, and some aspects of economic relations.

The meeting is the focus of immense interest among the U.S. media. Well-known American columnist Don Oberdorfer noted in THE WASHINGTON POST today that it opens three days of talks on the next steps in the relationship of the two nuclear superpowers.

After the White House discussion Shevardnadze and Soviet officials accompanying him will leave for Wyoming where the Soviet foreign minister meets with U.S. Secretary of State James Baker on September 22 and 23.

It was announced here that the two will discuss another Soviet-U.S. summit.

Comments on Talks With Bush

LD2209000189 Moscow TASS in English 2525 GMT 21 Sep 89

[Text] Washington September 22 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze, who had arrived in Washington on an official visit, met U.S. President George Bush on Thursday. He conveyed to him a message from Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev. The meeting, which had originally been planned for an hour, lasted for more than 90 minutes.

After the meeting with Bush, Shevardnadze answerd journalists' questions.

"I had a very important conversation with the President," he said. "We discussed questions on a large scale, including Soviet-American relations, disarmament, arms control and other international issues. We made concrete suggestions on some matters. But, I would not like to go into details now, because all these issues will be discussed concretely in Wyoming. The conversation was very interesting, frank and open. I am very much satisfied with this meeting. Incidentally, that was not my first meeting with President Bush and it is not surprising that it had been good and had passed in a good atmosphere," Shevardnadze said.

Asked whether he and Bush had set the date for a Soviet-American summit, Shevardnadze said: "No, we did not set the date, but I do not rule out that we may have something more definite to say on this question in Wyoming. We concluded that a summit is, undoubtedly, necessary, but the time for it should be discussed and specified. You, certainly, understand that such a summit should be prepared seriously and thoroughly."

Speaking about Mikhail Gorbachev's message to the U.S. President, Shevardnadze said that it concerned "mainly arms control issues, the entire set of arms control problems, including the ABM Treaty, strategic offensive weapons, conventional arms, the Geneva and Vienna talks, chemical weapons, fissionable materials, nuclear tests and the U.S. President's idea of the 'open sky' which we had vigorously supported."

The next question to the Soviet foreign minister concerned his criticism of Bush for being too slow in advancing on some disarmament issues and whether he still felt like that after his Thursday meeting with the President.

"It is good you asked me this," Shevardnadze answered. "I did not say that the President was not fast enough. I expressed my dissatisfaction with the state of affairs at the Geneva talks. They are stalling, there is no serious headway there. But now interesting proposals are in the offing from both parties, which means that criticism helps".

Asked if any new and interesting ideas were put forward by the American side during the meeting, Shevardnadze [said] that "there are sensitive matters which are better not disclosed in passing, because they require serious discussion".

He noted that all the proposals will be discussed during talks with Secretary of State James Baker in Wyoming on September 22-23.

U.S. Secretary of State James Baker told a briefing in the White House after his meeting with Shevardnadze that the talks had been productive.

He stated that the discussion touched on five subjects: summit, recent developments in the Soviet Union, regional conflicts, human rights and the letter on arms control which Eduard Shevardnadze brought with him.

On the perspectives for a summit meeting, Baker said that the question was widely discussed and "we hope to determine in general terms the time of the next summit meeting during the stay in Wyoming".

President Gorbachev's letter, Baker went on to say, is a reply to President Bush's letter sent three months ago. Gorbachev's letter is a circumstantial, technical reply to the President Bush letter.

Baker said that U.S. experts were scrupulously studying the letter's content and he and Shevardnadze would discuss it in further detail in Wyoming.

President Gorbachev, he pointed out, shares President Bush's anxiety concerning the strengthening of strategic stability and securing survival.

He also agrees with that special attention which the U.S. President attaches to upgrading control and verification procedures, Baker said.

In Wyoming, Baker said, we hope to make considerable headway in the field of control, verification and consolidating stability.

President Gorbachev agrees with President Bush also in the need to move ahead toward banning chemical weapons, the secretary of state said.

In this connection, the memorandum on mutual understanding in the field of data exchange on chemical arms to be signed in Wyoming looks like a serious step forward.

Baker stated that the Gorbachev letter is a positive response to President Bush's letter. He noted that, despite the complexity and intricacy of the present problems, the United States hoped for making headway at the talks in discussing the whole agenda on arms control.

Speaks About Perestroyka, Reforms

LD2209102989 Moscow TASS in English 1010 GMT 22 Sep 89

[Text] Washington September 22 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze met U.S. President George Bush in the White House on Thursday.

Shevardnadze conveyed best wishes from Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev.

Bush thanked Shevardnadze for the good wishes and spoke warmly about his meetings with the Soviet president. He said that the United States is closely monitoring developments in the Soviet Union.

He noted that there is not a single serious and responsible American who does not understand the importance of Soviet reforms and does not wish success to Soviet perestroika.

Shevardnadze spoke about perestroika, which he said "has already created a fundamentally new situation in the country."

This situation "is characterised by high political activity of people and by trends towards economic improvement through new forms of socialist management—cost-accounting, cooperatives and leasing."

Shevardnadze also pointed to radical changes in the country's spiritual life.

He said that the Soviet Union still has great difficulties, such as inflation and the lack of consumer goods, and that food and housing programmes are being implemented too slowly.

"These difficulties can be explained. They have largely been brought out by the transition period when old economic mechanisms no longer work and new ones are not yet in full swing," he said.

"The Soviet leadership does not dramatise the situation. What is most important is that there is a clear-cut concept of perestroika, which is being consistently implemented.

"The policy of renovation is fully supported by the overwhelming majority of Soviet people."

Shevardnadze expressed confidence that perestroika "will accelerate its pace and reach the planned target of socialist renovation."

He delivered a letter from Gorbachev, setting forth new ideas and considerations on topical issues of Soviet-American relations, above all those related to disarmament and security.

Shevardnadze and Bush exchanged views on the issues raised in the message, in a businesslike and constructive manner.

They agreed that there is good foundation for continuing fruitful dialogue and drawing closer the two countries' stands in negotiations between Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker in Wyoming.

It was agreed that Shevardnadze and Baker will consider the whole range of issues on the Soviet-U.S. agenda, including regional problems, humanitarian cooperation, bilateral issues and transnational issues.

Both sides emphasised the importance of a transition in Soviet- U.S. relations to active interaction in the interests of strengthening peace and security and developing cooperation.

The meeting was characterised by a high degree of mutual understanding and trustfulness.

Shevardnadze, Baker Arrive in Wyoming for Talks

LD2209052889 Moscow TASS in English 0450 GMT 22 Sep 89

[Text] Jackson (Wyoming) September 22 TASS—By TASS special correspondents Nikolay Turkatenko and Oleg Polyakovskiy:

Negotiations between Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker are due to open near Jackson, a small health resort town in a picturesque valley in the western part of the United States, on Friday morning [22 September].

Shevardnadze and Baker arrived there by a special State Department plane on Thursday evening after Shevardnadze had a meeting in Washington with President George Bush to whom the Soviet foreign minister brought a letter from Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev with, Shevardnadze told journalists, important ideas in the sphere of arms control and proposals to lessen military confrontation.

Baker said that the Shevardnadze-Bush meeting had been productive and said that the administration's experts had already started to study the content of Gorbachev's letter.

At the Jackson airfield Baker and Shevardnadze were met by journalists, representing the world press, who came there to provide a coverage of negotiations between Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State Baker.

Shevardnadze Issues Arrival Statement

LD2209085489 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0740 GMT 22 Sep 89

[By TASS special correspondent]

[Text] Jackson (Wyoming), 22 Sep (TASS)—On Thursday Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs, and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker arrived in Wyoming, where they will hold talks over a period of 2 days. After his arrival at Jackson Airport Eduard Shevardnadze made the following statement:

First of all, I would like to thank the Secretary of State, whose kind invitation makes it possible for us to hold the talks in such unusual conditions. We are grateful to the Wyoming State authorities for their hospitality and to the numerous representatives of the press for the great interest shown in our meeting.

A good beginning to our work has been made today. A meeting took place with President George Bush, to whom we handed Mikhail Gorbachev's message, concerning major questions of limitation and reduction of armaments. I think that I will express the common view if I say that fair prospects are now opening up for making headway in this most important sphere and in other directions of Soviet-U.S. relations.

I also think that today preconditions are developing whereby this interaction can be raised to a qualitatively new level. I hope that these next few days will lead us along this important path. What are needed are fresh ideas, and I am sure that the fresh mountain air of Wyoming will help to inspire and develop them. What are needed are specific deeds to the mutual benefit of the sides. As I understood from the conversations with the President and from the chat with the secretary of state on the aircraft, the U.S. side is also thinking along these lines.

I hope that when the talks are over we will be able to report to you about specific and important accords. If it transpires that we have come this far just to talk, that would be unforgivable. So we are geared up for results.

Shevardnadze's Upcoming Talks in U.S. Viewed

LD2109210889 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1645 GMT 21 Sep 89

[Text] [Announcer] We have already reported that Comrade Shevardnadze, USSR foreign affairs minister, has arrived in Washington. Today, when it will already be late evening in Moscow, his meeting with President Bush should take place in Washington. Tomorrow, and the day after tomorrow, our foreign affairs minister, will have talks with U.S. Secretary of State Baker. What will the themes and the prospects for these meetings and talks be? I ask Aleksandr Zholkver, our political observer, to speak about this, if you please:

[Zholkver] Both sides have already announced that a wide-ranging set of issues of Soviet-U.S. relations and world politics will be considered. I think that the current moment is in many ways a determined one, from the point of view of prospects for the development of Soviet-U.S. relations, both in the near future, and in the long term perspective. After all, important changes are now taking place in both countries. Our perestroyka has coincided, in time, with the beginning of the functioning of the new Washington administration, and it cannot help but be seen that these phenomena are in some way interconnected. I will quote as an example Eagleburger, the U.S. deputy secretary of state, who has just declared literally the following: huge changes in the nature of our exchanges with the Soviet leadership are, in the first instance, a result of the unprecedented events which are occurring within the Soviet Union. According to the extent of the development of these changes relations between the United States and the USSR may turn from those of rivalry, into those of cooperation.

It is true that far from everyone in Washington holds this point of view. Mitchell, the leader of the Democratic majority in the Senate, points to the, as he put it, almost nostalgic feelings for the times of the cold war which are felt by some figures in the current Washington administration. Cheney, the head of the Pentagon, first and foremost, belongs to these. During these very days, he is busy talking to those congressmen who favor reducing military spending. I think that the influence of the military-industrial complex in the United States, which numbers about 40,000 enterprises, should not be dismissed. On the whole, it is considered, 26 million Americans live off the Pentagon's budget. If the reduction of the armed forces and conversion of the defense industry is in our country connected with considerable problems, then it is quite possible to imagine the whole complexity of an analogous perestroyka under the conditions of the U.S. market economy with its very strict competition. So, I think that progress at the Soviet-U.S. talks on reducing arms—and this, as Comrade Shevardnadze declared before his departure for the United States, is the key issue—will be no easy business.

But all the same, I would not give myself over to pessimism. First, the conclusion and successful implementation of a Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles graphically shows the possibility of an effective agreement in the disarmament sphere—including even the nuclear one.

Second, a whole series of important factors are operating in favor of disarmament. First and foremost is our perestroyka itself, which is destroying the image of an enemy with which the arms race was justified. The renunciation of previous stereotypes can be seen both in the U.S. Congress, about which I have already spoken, and among the U.S. public as a whole, which is quite sharply criticizing the new U.S. Administration for its slowness in resolving the very important issues of interrelations with the Soviet Union, first and foremost on the problems of reducing arms. And I think that precisely for this reason both President Bush and his secretary of state have started to speak so actively, over the most recent days, about the fact that the elaboration of new proposals for the reduction of arms which, as they say, will attract the attention of the Soviet Union, has finished at last.

But I would like in connection with this to note that the problem of curbing the arms race does not only concern the United States and the Soviet Union. Not only the widest circles of the world public but also governmental figures of an ever-larger number of countries are more and more insistently favoring the reductions of both arms and military spending, and the use of taxpayers' money not for the production of arms for destruction, but for resolving very acute social and ecological problems. The agenda, which has only just been confirmed, for the current session of the UN General Assembly bears graphic witness to this. So I think that the situation in the world itself must rouse both sides, at the current extremely important stage of the Soviet-U.S. dialogue, to responsible, constructive actions.

U.S. 'Optimism' Before Visit, Talks Cited

PM2209130189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 8

[Own correspondent L. Koryavin dispatch: "Forecasts Dominated by Optimism"]

[Text] Washington—It has been a long time since the White House press center has been as crowded with journalists as on the day of USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze's arrival in Washington and his meeting with President Bush. The new round of Soviet-U.S. talks immediately became the number one theme in the U.S. mass media.

The commentaries are highlighting some of the most important aspects. First and foremost is the fact that Soviet-U.S. contacts have acquired a permanent basis. There has been a qualitative improvement in mutual relations between the two countries. Trends toward their active rapprochement are in evidence. And among the main questions the dominant one is: What will be the next joint steps toward nuclear disarmament?

The mood of commentators here toward the round of talks now in progress is optimistic. According to ABC, for example, "the dialogue will be useful and will contribute much that is new and constructive." At the same time, observers and politicians have recently expressed criticisms of the U.S. Administration. In the opinion of many people, it is not showing sufficient activeness on disarmament questions.

I talked with Michael Sullivan, governor of Wyoming, where the meeting between E.A. Shevardnadze and Secretary of State Baker will take place. He said:

"I'm sure I express Americans' feelings when I say that I regard the development of U.S.-USSR relations with hope and optimism. I have been attentively following the processes taking place in the USSR. Millions of U.S. citizens know about perestroyka now. This really is the start of a new age. We rate highly Chairman M.S. Gorbachev's role and his personal contribution to the process of strengthening peace and improving Soviet-U.S. relations. The inhabitants of Wyoming are glad and furthermore are proud that the latest Soviet-U.S. dialogue will take place in our state."

Those thoughts are shared by Wyoming congressman Craig Thomas:

"Both the U.S. and the Soviet peoples want peace. That is a truth which requires no proof. We are witnessing the important process of the improvement of U.S.-USSR relations. This process is wide-ranging: meetings between statesmen, contacts between representatives of the public and scientists, trips by students, a whole series of agreements, and of course, most important of all, the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles.

"Our state is often mentioned in the same context as MX missiles. One of their main bases is to be sited here. But the deployment of any missiles in the United States or the USSR is a consequence of the past, when both sides considered that this would mean security for them. I share the views of those who believe that dialogue produces far greater guarantees of security for our country than increasing nuclear potentials."

Spokesman Comments on U.S. Exercises in Pacific

LD2109213189 Moscow TASS in English 2118 GMT 21 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 21 TASS—The United States and its allies are demonstrating their military might at a time when Soviet peace initiatives have shown concrete ways towards lowering military confrontation in Europe and the Asia-Pacific region, a spokesman for the USSR Defence Ministry told TASS, commenting on the Pacex-89 military exercises in the Pacific Ocean.

These are the biggest U.S exercises in the Asia Pacific region since World War II by their tasks, scope and the number of troops and means involved.

The headquarters, formations and units of the armed forces of Japan, South Korea, Canada, the Philippines and some other countries are taking part in the manoeuvres. The exercises involve a total of more than 200,000 troops, more than 500 planes, up to 100 naval ships, including four aircraft carriers and a battleship carrying Tomahawk cruise missiles.

Pacex-89 were timed to coincide with a series of major exercises of the NATO allied forces "Autumn Forge-89" in Europe and the Atlantic.

This illustrates the single orientation of the troop and naval exercises being held by the United States and its allies in different parts of the world, the Soviet spokesman said.

China

Prospects for Soviet-Chinese Ties Examined

OW2109134689 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 14 Sep 89

[Nikolayev commentary: "Prospects for Soviet-Chinese Relations"—from the "Current Events and Commentaries" program]

[Text] Dear listeners: Gorbachev, discussing Soviet-Chinese relations in a speech delivered in Krasnoyarsk a year ago, pointed out that we may as well say that the friendship and trust between the people of the two countries are growing and so are their mutual interests, which have been replenished with new substance. On this, our station Nikolayev writes the following commentary:

Today, 4 months after the Soviet-Chinese summit, the Soviet leader's above remark can be viewed with a wider dimension. The complete normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations opened up new vistas for broadening good-neighborly relations between the two socialist countries and laid the political foundation for cooperation in various fields. New contents have been added to the agreements reached between the Soviet and Chinese leaders during their meetings last May, which decided upon the primary direction of bilateral cooperation, most of all in the economic field. The two sides decided a number of specific projects during the meeting of the Soviet-Chinese Committee for Economic, Trade, Scientific, and Technical Cooperation last July. For example, a plan for Soviet-Chinese economic, scientific, and technical cooperation before the year 2000 shall be worked out before the end of this year. The two sides also discussed cooperation plans in energy, transportation, metallurgy, light industry, agriculture, and other areas. Finally, there is the regional cooperation plan for encouraging Chinese citizens in the border areas to work in the Soviet Union.

The course of developments in the two countries is also of principled significance to Soviet-Chinese relations. We are willing to exchange both positive and negative experiences in socialist construction with the Chinese side. A Soviet parliamentary delegation, led by Lukyanov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, is currently visiting China. We hope that the visit will further promote and develop the Soviet-Chinese relations founded at the Beijing summit last May. Exchange of experience in reform by all Soviet and Chinese organizations will be an important component of Soviet-Chinese dialogue, and it will help both sides understand better the conditions of the other side—for example, what is the people's concern and what decisions have been taken. Obviously, when both sides understand the other side's concern and respect its independent stand in solving problems, it will be easier to carry out bilateral cooperation and solve existing problems in each side. I believe that at the USSR Supreme Soviet session, to be opened on 25 September, deputies will hear, with great interest, the Soviet parliamentary delegation's report about its experience in China.

PRC-USSR Role in Regional Conflicts Viewed

OW2209030189 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0600 GMT 20 Sep 89

[Volskiy commentary]

[Text] Efforts to mediate regional conflicts in the world are proceeding with twists and turns, and are even interrupted sometimes. This mediation is important and yet difficult. However, the efforts to mediate regional conflicts, including conflicts in Asia, are continuing despite difficulties. As everyone knows, regional conflicts are particularly frequent in Asia. Each regional conflict has its salient features and involves different forces.

In Asia, the mediation of various regional conflicts has yielded different results. For instance, military actions between Iran and Iraq have been at a standstill for more than 6 months, but no progress has been made yet in their peace talks. The situation in Afghanistan is different. The Geneva agreement was signed long ago and the Soviet Union has withdrawn its troops from there, but the fighting continues due to the belligerence of the uncompromising rebel forces and their foreign protectors. The situation in Cambodia is even more complex. The Paris conference held recently has pointed out both the difficulties and the likelihood of solving the problems facing this country.

All Asian people, including those involved in regional conflicts, earnestly hope that the conflicts will end and lasting peace will be established. If the fires in Afghanistan, Cambodia, and other regions are put out, security and peace will be much more stable in Asia and all other

regions in the world. This is why the summit meeting of nonaligned countries held in Belgrade recently paid great attention to this problem.

It merits our attention that the UN organizations are making more and more efforts to mediate regional conflicts. The Soviet Union resolutely supports the United Nations playing a greater role in mediating regional conflicts. As a permanent member of the Security Council, the Soviet Union is willing to make a due contribution to this important task. At the same time, it seeks cooperation with other world powers in performing the task.

Of course, the cooperation between the Soviet Union and China should play a special role in ending regional conflicts in Asia. Our two countries have not yet eliminated all their differences over regional issues, but these differences should not obstruct our cooperation in ending regional conflicts. The Soviet Union and China may take either joint or separate actions, but the actions must be in the spirit of goodwill for the purpose of seeking peace. We indeed should take such an attitude toward the regional conflicts in Asia.

Li Peng Comments on USSR-China Cooperation

LD2109222589 Moscow TASS in English 2207 GMT 21 Sep 89

[Text] Beijing September 21 TASS—The normalisation of relations between the Soviet Union and China have opened up broad opportunities for Sino-Soviet economic and scientific-technological cooperation, the Chinese newspaper RENMIN RIBAO quoted Li Peng, premier of the Chinese State Council, as saying on Thursday. Li Peng is currently on an inspection trip to China's northeastern regions.

Broader ties with the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe are an important part of the Chinese policy of openness to the world which takes into account specific economic features of China's northern neighbour. Chinese experts believe that difference in the natural and other resources in the Soviet Union and China enables them to complete and interchange isolated elements in each other's economies.

The Chinese premier urged the local authorities to develop the infrastructure of the country's northeast so that to bring it in line with the need to expand border trade with the Soviet Union.

Qian Qichen on PRC Foreign Policy Achievements

PM2109150789 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 16 Sep 89 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Main Achievement"]

[Text] Beijing, 15 Sep—PRC Foreign Minister Qian Qichen has voiced concern at the practice of foreign interference in other countries' internal affairs that exists in the world. In an article published in RENMIN RIBAO timed to coincide with the approaching 40th anniversary of the PRC's formation he writes that some Western states still regard their views on the world surrounding them as the ultimate truth. If something happens that those countries do not like, the author observes, they immediately try to exert political pressure and resort to economic sanctions. While paying lip service to "freedom," "equality," and "democracy," they follow quite different principles in international relations.

The defense of state sovereignty and national dignity and commitment to an independent and autonomous foreign policy throughout 4 decades have been the main achievements of Chinese diplomacy, the minister stressed. The fact that the PRC was able to become a powerful world force independent of other states is its undoubted achievement. He listed the PRC's readmission to the United Nations, the switch from enmity to dialogue in Sino-American relations, and the normalization of Chinese-Soviet relations after long confrontation among the major foreign policy achievements.

Pursuing the five principles of peaceful coexistence, the republic offers to completely ban and destroy nuclear, chemical, biological, and space weapons and advocates large-scale reduction of conventional arms.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

TASS on Vietnamese Withdrawal From Cambodia

LD2109171489 Moscow TASS in English 1526 GMT 21 Sep 89

[Text] Phnom Penh September 21 TASS—The final phase of the Vietnamese troop withdrawal from Cambodia opened with a colourful farewell ceremony in the town of Siemreab today.

In keeping with a decision by the governments of the two countries, the 26,000 Vietnamese servicemen still in this country will be back home by September 27.

The 200,000-strong Vietnamese contingent was moved into Cambodia in December 1978 to help its insurgents to deliver it from the criminal Pol Pot-Ieng Sari regime.

Starting from 1982, there have been seven partial pullouts of Vietnamese forces which have gradually turned over the mission of protecting the country to the Cambodian National Army.

Cambodian leaders and Vietnamese official representatives predict that the Cambodian Army with over 50,000 regular troops and about 100,000 militiamen, will be able to repulse the armed opposition.

The tripartite opposition, consisted of the followers of Prince Sihanhouk, former Cambodian Premier Son Sann and Pol Pot's group and operating out of Thailand, has been waging a war of subversion on Cambodian territory.

The international conference on Cambodia in Paris, which was suspended at the end of last month, failed to produce an agreement creating machinery for the international verification of the troop withdrawal, but dozens of correspondents, including reporters from the western mass media, and observers from a number of countries have come to Cambodia these days to watch it.

The Vietnamese troops will leave Cambodia by land (through the border checkpoints in Patanakiri, Kampong Cham, Svay Rieng, Prey Veng and Takev provinces), by sea (from the port of Kampong Saom) and by air (from the airport of Pouthichentong).

Burmese Leadership Facing Foreign Criticism

BK1609084489 Moscow in Burmese to Burma 1030 GMT 15 sep 89

[Aleksandr Vladimirov commentary: "Why Is Washington Dissatisfied at the Situation in Myanmar"]

[Text] After a year in power, the leaders of the military government in Myanmar still face the same problems in dealing with Western countries. The United States is one of the leading critics of the military regime in Myanmar, and certain senators and spokesmen have continued their anti-Burmese agitation and propaganda, criticizing and blaming the military government mainly on human rights violations and the torture of people who have participated in the movement for democracy.

However, most of the commentaries on this issue omit certain related facts and this raises doubts about the sincerity of Washington's stand on Myanmar affairs. It should also be pointed out that the U.S. stand on Myanmar affairs in not in accordance with the norms of conduct in relations between sovereign states.

The U.S. acted in much the same way prior to the 18 September military takeover last year. As you all know, during the height of the mass demonstrations last year, U.S. Congressman Stephen Solarz visited Myanmar on 4 September. Not only did he try to act as a mediator, according to the U.S. State Department, but he also met with Burmese opposition leaders and the then Myanmar president, Dr Maung Maung. After the meetings he suggested that some Myanmar leaders should leave the country and said the U.S. could provide assistance.

Mr Solarz's was not the only one. Another U.S. congressman, Mr Dana Rohrabacher, entered Myanmar illegally in November 1988 and visited Thay Baw Bo where he blatantly advised them to seek assistance from the U.S. and start armed opposition against the Yangon government. There is other evidence which points to a U.S. attempt to extend its influence over Myanmar for its own benefit.

During a recent press conference Brigadier General Khin Nyunt, chief of the Military Intelligence Service, recounted these events. He recalled the rumors last year in Yangon which claimed that secret talks had been held with the U.S. during which Washington proposed the establishment of military facilities on Coco Island after the expiration of the lease of the American bases in the Philippines. Another rumor, on 12 September 1988, claimed that a U.S. aircraft carrier equipped with amphibious craft and accompanied by five U.S. warships was approaching Myanmar waters.

Brig Gen Khin Nyunt also disclosed that the Myanmar security services have been able to expose secret assistance and funds extended by Western embassies to antigovernment organizations in Myanmar. Washington's activities in Myanmar are in compliance with the secret U.S. policy of guarding American interests by political, diplomatic, propaganda, military, and subversive means.

There are other facts which suggest that this secret policy is also being applied to Myanmar. For example, the aforementioned Congressman Rohrabacher was helped in his election by people involved in secret operations abroad such as the Iran-Contra affair. American diplomats have frequently remarked that there are no American interests in Myanmar. However, it appears that leaders in Washington have reason to be unhappy about developments in Myanmar. Currently, American diplomats are trying to create a political situation which is conducive for a continued U.S. military presence in Southeast Asia.

At a time when the countries in the region are unable to clearly state their stand on the U.S. presence in the region, the Myanmar Government has stated clearly that they will never allow foreign bases on Myanmar soil and that the country will continue to follow an independent foreign policy based on active neutrality. The state newspaper, the WORKING PEOPLE'S DAILY, stated recently that Myanmar has never joined any military pact or associations and that it intends to continue to practice an independent foreign policy in the future. Is this why the American authorities and American journalists are criticizing the actions of the Myanmar military regime?

Burma After 1 Year of Military Rule

BK1709131089 Moscow in Burmese to Burma 1030 GMT 17 Sep 89

[Aleksandr Vladimirov commentary: "One Year Under the Rule of the Military Government, What Lies in the Future for Myanmar?]

[Text] One year ago, media sources in Myanmar reported that the military had taken over power. A group of military leaders headed by General Saw Maung had wrested the state power. It was, as they claim, to prevent the nation from disintegrating and to prepare for the holding of multiparty general elections. Our station correspondent makes the following observation regarding the situation in Myanmar today:

The department store in Yangon was seen carrying refrigerators, bicycles, vehicle spare parts, pots and pans, computers, video machines, and other goods. Previously, these goods could only be found in the black market.

The department store, opened by Daewoo Company of South Korea in July, outwardly appears to be the first sign of prosperity that the military government hopes to achieve by opening the nation's doors to foreign entrepreneurs. But the goods on display at the Daewoo Department Store serve more as reminders that under the actual conditions in the country today, the majority of the people cannot afford them. This should not come as a surprise to anyone. No one really expected that such a serious economic hardship that emerged in Myanmar as a result of a historical phase could be overcome within a year. Experts believe that it will take quite some time to see a marked improvement in the economy. Their prediction is most likely to be true. This is because under the situation today, while some factors contribute to the development of Myanmar, there are also other factors that contradict such a trend.

The United States and the European Economic Community are continuing their boycott of Myanmar. Despite such difficulties, the Myanmar Government's efforts to make fundamental changes concerning foreign trade have begun to bear fruit. China, Thailand, and four major industrial countries in Asia have shown their willingness to step up economic cooperation with Myanmar. The economic cooperation could even be better if there were adequate laws and no bureaucratic red tape in Myanmar.

However, it is quite evident that the fees being earned by the Yangon government through licensing agreements with foreign concerns for the exploitation of minerals are not enough to improve the economic situation in the country. But one thing is quite clear to everyone: No matter what government replaces the current military government, the country cannot afford to go back to its isolationist policies.

The question is: What type of government is going to replace the Gen Saw Maung government? Gen Saw Maung himself has said on a number of occasions that the military would make way for the next government, whatever government that may be. Those, both at home and abroad, who criticize the military government are skeptical of that statement. But no one can deny the fact that the laws protecting a single party system have been scrapped, that opportunity has been given to establish a multitude of political parties and for organizations wielding great influence to emerge, that a timetable has been set for multiparty elections, and that necessary preparations are already being made for the elections.

The increasing antagonism between some opposition parties and the military government has been the key factor for complicating and aggravating the situation in Myanmar recently. There are allegations that the military government has been restricting the political movement of parties, suppressing active political leaders, and helping the National Unity Party—the offshoot of the Burma Socialist Program Party.

The military government in turn has accused some political forces—both left-wing and right-wing—of conspiring to wrest power by force. During a recent press conference, Brigadier General Khin Nyunt, head of Defense Services Intelligence, declared that elements abroad and some Western embassies have been involved in such activities. This is indeed something to worry about. International experience has proved that foreign interference cannot help resolve national antagonisms; in fact, it could make things worse. Such interference can only aggravate the antagonisms and cause unfortunate consequences.

When studying developments in Myanmar, it is important to have an objective view in understanding that the country being ruled by the military government today is the effect of a cause and not the cause itself. It is an effect of gravely complicated events that emerged in the country in the past decade. Perhaps it is not surprising that the military took the political stage, because there was no other force to organize and lead the democracy movement that emerged between August and the first half of September last year.

Everyone knows that installing democracy in a society—any type of society—is a very difficult and complicated task. It is necessary to have some political experience as well as [words indistinct] experience. Such a phenomenon has to pass through some phases. The State Law and Order Restoration Council ruling the country is one such phase. It is only the Myanmar people who will make the final decision on how they intend to emerge from this phase and the pace with which they will proceed to the next phase.

Leaders Greet Indonesia's Suharto on National Day

BK2109021289 Moscow in Indonesian to Indonesia 1300 GMT 20 Sep 89

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and the USSR Council of Ministers have cabled a congratulatory message to President Suharto on the occasion of the Indonesian national day, namely the 44th anniversary of the Independence Day.

The cable among other things noted the [words indistinct] of Soviet-Indonesian relations and hoped that they will be actively upgraded in various areas for the interests of the two countries and peoples as well as for peace and stability in the Asia-Pacific and throughout the world.

In his reply to Mikhail Gorbachev and Nikolay Ryzhkov, President Suharto, on behalf of the Indonesian

Government and people, expressed his sincere gratitude for the congratulatory message on the occasion of the Indonesian national day.

Near East & South Asia

Moiseyev Visits Kabul, Meets With Najibullah

LD2209054489 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0531 GMT 22 Sep 89

[Text] Kabul, 22 Sep (TASS)—Army General M.A. Moiseyev, chief of General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces and first deputy USSR defense minister, paid a working visit to the Republic of Afghanistan.

During his stay in Kabul, he was received by Najibullah, the Republic's president and general secretary of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan Central Committee.

Afghan Foreign Minister Stops Over in Moscow

PM2109132789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Moscow Stopover"]

[Text] Afghan Foreign Minister 'A. Wakil was in Moscow 16-17 September. He was on his way from Kabul to New York to attend the 44th session of the UN General Assembly.

'A. Wakil was greeted and seen off at the airport by USSR First Deputy Foreign Minister Yu.M. Vorontsov.

Vorontsov, Pakistan Envoy Discuss Afghanistan

LD2109165389 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1600 GMT 21 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow, 21 Sep (TASS)—Yuliy Vorontsov, USSR first deputy foreign minister, today received Pakistan's ambassador in Moscow, Abdul Sattar, at the latter's request.

During their conversation they discussed matters connected with the present situation surrounding Afghanistan, and also the problem of securing the release of Soviet prisoners of war captured by the Afghan armed opposition.

Vorontsov Receives New Iraqi Ambassador

LD2109204589 Moscow TASS in English 1615 GMT 21 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 21 TASS—USSR First Deputy Foreign Minister Yuliy Vorontsov received new Iraqi ambassador to the Soviet Union Gafel Jasim Husayn today in connection with the forthcoming presentation of his credentials.

Indian Finance Minister Interviewed on Visit

LD1909230289 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1905 GMT 18 Sep 89

[From "The World Today" program presented by Aleksandr Zholkver; interview with Indian Finance Minister S.B. Chavan by correspondent Sergey Pustovoyt; in English with superimposed Russian translation; in Moscow; date not given—recorded]

[Text] [Pustovoyt] Mr Minister, how do you appraise your visit to the Soviet Union?

[Chavan] During my visit I met Abalkin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; Pavlov, minister of finance; and Katushev, minister of foreign economic relations. In accordance with the Soviet-Indian protocol on cooperation, which was adopted after President Gorbachev's talks with Prime Minister Rajiv Ghandi in 1988, we signed a credit agreement to a total sum of R990 million. This money will go to development of power engineering in our country. In turn, Soviet people will be able to receive nearly R1 billion worth of consumer goods from India on which we plan to settle up by the agreement.

[Pustovoyt] Tell me, what's your impression of the influence of perestroyka in our country on the development of Soviet-Indian relations?

[Chavan] I had occasion to visit several towns of the Soviet Union and I saw how many problems your country faces, but the changes in the Soviet economy are actively drawing the USSR into the world economic process. Therefore, we are following with great goodwill the changes in the Soviet Union and are sure that the successful progress of perestroyka will promote a strengthening of our cooperation.

Sub-Saharan Africa

South Africa Role in Namibian Independence Viewed

MB1909145189 Moscow in Zulu to Southern Africa 1930 GMT 16 Sep 89

[Igor Patovskiy commentary—announcer read]

[Text] On 14 September SWAPO [South-West African People's Organization] leader Sam Nujoma returned home to Namibia. Such an event cannot be ignored, for this was the return of the leader of a very important political organization in that country, a remarkable man who is part of the history of SWAPO's liberation struggle from its inception until the present in Namibia. Not much has been said about his very significant influence on the Namibian independence process. Even those who are not members of SWAPO have remarked that underestimating his role in the process would be a big mistake indeed, and the more so with the prevailing situation in Namibia.

With preparations for elections now so far gone, it is timely to recall what has been said many a time. In May, for example, the British publication AFRICA CONFIDENTIAL noted that within a very short time the status quo in Namibia would change. The signal for this would be the return of SWAPO's leadership. Their return was no small occasion, and they received a rousing welcome. Their return marks a point of no return in the independence process.

Within the past month the leaders of South Africa have devised ways of bringing SWAPO down. As for how successful they have been, that will be seen in the elections in November. The South African leaders cannot get involved in much mischief, however. Any untoward changes now by South Africa's president could put him in a very awkward situation in the future. The last word still rests with SWAPO, for the emergence of a SWAPO president in Namibia will influence much in the region.

The assassination of one of SWAPO's leaders, the first white to join the organization, Anton Lubowski, has focused attention on the regime, and this will rob it of its chance to continue its devious dealings with SWAPO. The South-West African administrator general was attempting to scare Sam Nujoma into not returning to Namibia. Pretoria can now no longer take SWAPO inside Namibia lightly. The return of SWAPO's leader, Sam Nujoma, has put a stop to any more treachery.

Groundwork for Internal South Africa Talks Viewed

MB2009143889 Moscow in English to Southern Africa 1900 GMT 19 Sep 89

[Mikhail Tsirolov commentary—read by announcer]

[Text] Summing up the results of the recent parliamentary elections in South Africa, the newly elected president of the country, Frederik de Klerk, declared he was fully determined to lead South Africa along the road of peace to a new political situation. The African National Congress [ANC] of South Africa in turn advanced its own plan of political transformation in the country.

In the course of many years, the political strategy of the ANC was based on the assumption that the [words indistinct] in South Africa, and that it will be for the ANC. The emergence of a revolutionary situation in South Africa, and of an ensuing explosion, seemed to be inevitable as the direct consequences of the reign of political terror unleashed by the authorities, and also as a result of the activities of the national liberation movement.

This point of view has, however, been substantially revised of late. Emphasis has been shifted from the seizure of state power by force to the solution of conflict by peaceful negotiation. It cannot be said that this change of stand is a cardinal one in the activities of the ANC. [Words indistinct] the ANC never excluded the possibility of a peaceful settlement of conflict. This trend has become more likely now that the political situation in the country has changed, East-West relations have improved, and the Namibian crisis is abating.

The ANC can hardly place any great expectations on the policy course of the new leadership of the National Party, and on its capability of introducing any real and effective reform. Thabo Mbeki, a member of the National Executive Committee of the ANC, is very skeptical about the sincerity of the government striving to start a dialogue with the African majority. Nevertheless, the ANC has launched a broad diplomatic offensive aimed at laying the ground for the beginning of talks about future talks that may be constructive and concrete.

Last year the ANC published a draft program of the main directions of South Africa's constitutional development. The program is based on known articles of the Freedom Charter but takes a more pragmatic approach to the solution of the country's economic and political problems. The program, together with essential amendments, was discussed at the meetings of the ANC leadership with the representatives of the United Democratic Front and the Congress of South Africa Trade Unions, as well as representatives of the South African white community in Lusaka, where a communique was issued stressing the necessity of a political solution of the conflict.

At present the ANC's plan has become an official document of the Organization of African Unity [OAU]. It was given that status at last month's fourth session in Harare of the Special Committee on South Africa. It was given the name of a Declaration of the Special Committee on South Africa of the OAU, and reflects the general view of African countries on the (?prospects) of a peaceful settlement of conflict. It looks like the majority of South Africans who were forced to take up arms are of the same opinion. Alongside with calls to hold talks, the declaration also sets forth the principles of a future constitutional structure of South Africa, providing for equal citizenship and general national equality, irrespective of race, skin color, and origin, for a one-man, one-vote franchise.

In order to create the necessary political climate of peaceful negotiations, it was proposed to discontinue the state of emergency, release all political prisoners, legalize all banned organizations, and put an end to all political trials and executions. As yet the South African Government has not voiced its official attitude toward the ANC/OAU plan that has become part and parcel of the political declaration of the Nonaligned Movement approved at its conference in Belgrade.

Evidently this issue was also not discussed at the meeting of Zambian President Kenneth Kaunda with Frederik de Klerk in Livingstone. Nevertheless, an analysis of the development of events in South Africa points to the possibility of setting up bridges and contacts. Of course, this calls for full responsibility and political goodwill.

Anxiety Expressed Over Southwest Africa Situation

MB2009164789 Moscow in English to Southern Africa 1900 GMT 19 Sep 89

[Text] The massive manifestations against apartheid in South Africa that are continuing on a wide scale throughout the country after the recent parliamentary elections, and also the situation in Namibia where a prominent leader of SWAPO [South-West Africa People's Organization], Anton Lubowski, was killed, have given rise to worldwide anxiety.

The Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee has issued two statements about those events. Here is what Sergey Vidrin, one of the leaders of the Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee, told our correspondent in this connection:

[Begin recording] [Unidentified correspondent] To begin with, could you tell us about the statements issued by your public organization?

[Vidrin; all answers in Russian fading into English translation] The statements voice the anxiety of the participants in the movement for Afro-Asian solidarity over the present day situation in the south of the African continent. The parliamentary elections in South Africa, in which the African majority, as previously, did not take part, give rise to a wave of indignation in the country. The pre-election statements of the leader of the National Party, now South Africa's president, Frederik de Klerk, about his alleged striving to involve the Africans in the ruling of the country did not calm the participants in the movement for the eradication of apartheid as was evidently planned. On the contrary, the statements became a detonator. So far there are only empty talks about the need to abolish apartheid, talks that are not backed by any actual deeds. The country remains in a state of emergency, thousands of people are imprisoned for political reasons, most of the discriminatory laws remain in force, and the new government of South Africa refuses to start talks with the African National Congress [ANC]. All this suggests that De Klerk's declarations are all a maneuver aimed at basically preserving the existing regime by slightly changing the most odious laws.

The second statement made by the Soviet participants in the Afro-Asian movement of solidarity voices deep indignation over the murder of Anton Lubowski. It shows that the enemies of SWAPO—that represents the majority of the Namibian people—are going over to terroristic methods of intimidation, and this is a most dangerous trend that has to be put an end to from the very beginning. The two declarations reaffirm the Soviet people's solidarity with the struggle waged by the people of Namibia and South Africa, and by their militant vanguard, SWAPO and the ANC.

[Correspondent] But the Western mass media and media of a number of African countries continue to publish articles putting to doubt the Soviet Union, and the Soviet people's, solidarity with the ANC and SWAPO. What is your opinion about those statements?

[Vidrin] They are absolutely groundless. We maintain longstanding friendly ties with the ANC and SWAPO that were never swayed by any considerations to date. Thew ANC received all kinds of political, material, and moral assistance from our country and its public organizations. As regards SWAPO, over the last months we have sent by air several consignments of clothes, medicines, and foodstuffs. The last plane landed in Windhoek quite recently. A large cargo of essentials meant for Namibian refugees now in Angola arrived in the Angolan port of Namib. Two delegations of the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee have already visited Namibia, and a third one is getting ready to leave for that country. They will acquaint themselves with the situation there, and find out on the spot what the Namibian patriots are in need of. [end recording]

Southwestern African Peace Process Examined

MB1909133889 Moscow in English to Southern Africa 1900 GMT 18 Sep 89

[Text] Developments of recent days have drawn attention to the situation in southwest Africa. Over the last week the Havana session of a three-sided commission scrutinized the implementation of the settlement agreements signed last December in New York by Angola, Cuba, and South Africa.

The commission focused on the situation in Namibia. A search for peace has become the center-stage issue of the meeting of eight African leaders in Kinshasa today. Whether it was planned or not, the proximity of those issues is quite natural. It is impossible to resolve problems related to southwest Africa separately, since they are formed into a single knot. But if one is to seek a key to their solution, he should look for it in the Angolan internal settlement. It is scarcely possible to count on stability in Namibia until the war in Angola is over.

The Angolan settlement process, however, is in a deadlock. The cease-fire agreements reached in June in the Zairean town of Gbadolite was broken by UNITA [Union for the Total Liberation of Angola] a few days after it was signed. By the beginning of the Kinshasa meeting it was nonexistent, even formally, as Savimbi proclaimed it null and void. UNITA has been [words indistinct] talks with the government, using as a pretext the frustrations in interpreting the Gabdolite declaration. But this as a consequence [word indistinct] because of the deadlock. The [words indistinct] lies in the stance adopted by those who determine Savimbi's actions. The closer is Namibia's independence, the more evident is the role of the United States in part, to end the war that UNITA will never win. [sentence as heard]

The business circles are exasperated by the economic instability. There are forces suggesting that Angola's government should be won over to a Western side. But this is the objective of the Central Intelligence Agency of the United States, which believes there are few guarantees that the United States will retain its influence in Angola, and so UNITA cannot be abandoned. Results

are making themselves felt. On the eve of the Kinshasa meeting, the United States Department of State came out in support of UNITA and its aims—that is, an interim government in Angola which will be followed by a division of power in the country. One cannot help seeing in it an attempt to influence the outcome of the meeting. Savimbi made demands for a change of the mediator of the talks, obviously after President Mobutu was forced to acknowledge, following the previous Harare meeting of the eight leaders, that UNITA's claims were ungrounded. Savimbi did not specify who he'd like to see as a mediator, but it is evident what demands such a man should live up to.

Military Delegation Arrives in Mozambique

LD2109105989 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1014 GMT 21 Sep 89

[Text] Maputo, 21 Sep (TASS)—A Soviet military delegation, headed by Army General Anatoliy Betekhtin, first deputy commander in chief of the USSR's Ground Forces, arrived in Maputo yesterday. It will take part in the festivities devoted to the 25th anniversary of the establishment of the Popular Forces for the Liberation of Mozambique, FPLM, and the start of the armed struggle for national liberation.

Today the delegation visited a photographic exhibition which describes the FPLM's history past and present. The exhibition features arms, equipment, and uniforms seized in the battles with bandits.

East Europe

Medvedev Arrives in East Berlin for Conference

LD2109005189 Moscow TASS in English 2313 GMT 20 Sep 89

[Text] Berlin September 21 TASS—Soviet Politburo member and Central Committee Secretary Vadim Medvedev arrived in the capital of the German Democratic Republic today.

He will participate in a conference of the ideology secretaries of the communist parties of socialist countries.

Hungarian Communists, Opposition Complete Talks

PM2009144589 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 20 Sep 89 Single Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Important Stage of Talks"]

[Text] The latest stage of the tripartite political talks on the coordination of interests, in which delegations of the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party [MSZMP], the opposition "roundtable," and also the republic's social organizations are participating, has ended in Budapest. These talks were begun in June this year on the MSZMP's initiative for the purpose, it was pointed out, of shaping conditions for the creation of a democratic rule-of-law state based on a multiparty system.

The agreement on the results of this stage of the talks points out that their participants succeeded in achieving political concord on the draft laws with regard to making amendments to the constitution, the functioning and economic activity of the parties, elections of Hungarian National Assembly deputies, and making amendments to the criminal code.

Addressing the talks participants, MSZMP Chairman R. Nyers emphasized the significance of the stage that has ended, which marked an important step toward creating a system in which citizens themselves will display political will.

The MSZMP is, above all, a working people's party and therefore insists that state legal norms and laws should not prohibit the free functioning of party organizations at work places, R. Nyers emphasized.

The two opposition groupings refused to sign the agreement. The representative of the Union of Free Democrats accounted for this with reference to the MSZMP leadership's reluctance to terminate the activities of party organizations at work places, to abandon the property of megye newspapers, which belongs to the party, and to disband the worker militia.

Gallup Polls Hungarians' Political Inclinations

PM2009103189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Sep 89 Second Edition p 4

[A. Rudenko article under "Dialogue" feature answering reader's letter: "Who the Hungarians Trust"—first paragraph is reader's letter]

[Text] "I read with interest the 8 August PRAVDA article by V. Gerasimov entitled 'MSZMP on the Road of Change.' What is the attitude of Hungarians toward the various political parties and groupings that have sprung up in Hungary recently? A. Slesarev, Moscow"

One of the oldest and most prestigious public opinion poll services—the Gallup Institute—has conducted a first-ever mass poll in Hungary. The poll produced many surprises. To judge by its results, Hungarians are skeptical about traditional forms of political activity. Only one out of three people polled trusts the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party [MSZMP], but the figure is the same for the new political parties, too. Only the trade unions recorded a lower score. The greatest confidence is enjoyed by the press—72 percent, followed by the church (67 percent), and the government (62 percent). Slightly more than half of those polled approve of the parliament, to which elections will be held next year.

Just what are the MSZMP's chances at the forthcoming elections? Some 28 percent of those polled have not yet determined their attitude. Some 26 percent are planning to vote for the MSZMP, and about the same number are

planning to vote for the leading "alternative" parties and movements: 9 percent for the Hungarian Democratic Forum, 7 percent each for the Independent Smallholders Party and the Social Democratic Party, and 5 percent for the Young Democrats' Alliance. The research also showed that Hungarians are tired of the political kaleidoscope and will vote at the elections for specific people and their action plans. Only 3 out of 10 Hungarians are familiar with the MSZMP program, and only 1 Hungarian in 10 is familiar with any "alternative" party's program.

Hungary is now actively discussing the question of setting up the institution of the presidency. The most likely candidates for this top post would be, according to the poll results, Imre Pozsgay, member of the MSZMP Presidium and minister of state; Miklos Nemeth, member of the MSZMP Presidium and chairman of the Hungarian Council of Ministers; and Zoltan Kiraly, representative of the "Independent Parliamentary Group" at the Hungarian National Assembly.

Budapest Radio Queries Pamyat Member Vasilyev

LD2009230289

[Editorial Report] Budapest Domestic Service in Hungarian at 2030 GMT on 19 September carries a program entitled "Russian Opposition Speaks," in which Geza Gecse interviews Dmitriy Vasilyev, described as "the national patriot," and his associates. The program begins with Gecse's introduction to the recent political developments in the USSR, which permitted the reappearance of fascist, extreme anti-Semitic movements, such as the Federation of Saint Mikhail Archangel, or the Russian National Federation. Pamyat, or memory, last year became a Patriotic National Front whose center is headed by Dmitriy Vasilyev. The center lost several splinter groups like the national socialist wing headed by Sychov, which organized a campaign for removing OGONYEK'S editor-in-chief and which holds the activities of Stalin in great esteem. Another splinter group headed Emelyanov rejects even the Christian Orthodox religion as alien and calls for a return to the adoration of old Russian pagan gods. Emelyanov is known for his book "De-Zionisation" which was published in the West in the 1970s. Pamyat is also present in Leningrad, but its stronghold is in Moscow.

Gecse then replays a recording he made at the 8 June 1989 mass meeting of Pamyat, chaired by Vasilyev and addressed by Kim Andreyev, deputy chairman of the Pamyat National Patriotic Front. Gecse then interviews Dmitriy Vasilyev.

Gecse and Vasilyev discuss the "Pamyat" emblem in which the bell signifying a call to alertness has been assuaged with a two-headed eagle, the symbol of the tsarist empire. Vasilyev says the uniform is black and says Pamyat is an army which is "fed up with indiscipline, immorality, corruption, and soullessness under the aegis of democracy."

Vasilyev declares that he is an "enemy to the Democratic Alliance Party because it—like the Russian People's Front—is a purely Zionist organization; they do not shun even from using violence." Vasilyev derides the Democratic Alliance Party as a supporter of "cosmopolitanism which is alien to a crime against the nation." Vasilyev then says that his group is against Marxism, "against all political doctrines, political parties." "Our aim is national consciousness which is not a political program." We are against "partyocracy" on the basis of the cultural, historical development of the Russian nation." While the Democratic Alliance Party wants a European Ghandiism and imposes on Russia the idea which is next in vogue abroad, we want our national structure. Vasilyev supports the restoration of monarchy: "The ruler has always been the expression of the nation's wishes and the monarchy itself the embodiment of the power of the people."

In response to a question from Gecse, Vasilyev says that the Russian people's front organizations have been created artificially to fragment the idea of national resurgence, similarly to the other informal organisations like those headed by Sychov, Ponomarev, Filamonov. "All these were formed with aims of provocation, to discredit Pamyat, to dirty my name. These factions were created by the Moscow Party Committee [as heard] and the KGB."

Discussion then moves onto the merits of 1,000 years of Tsardom. Vasilyev contrasts the always victorious, enormously rich times when food problems did not exist with the present. He says he would like to ask Gorbachev "how it was possible to impoverish this enormous empire, to put it into a situation existing today when it is bowing from the waist, begging for donations of mercy. I could ask Mikhail Sergeyevich, in his capacity as party member, head of state, why several millions died in Soviet concentration camps, why were these people shot in the head, executed, tortured to death? In the name of what kind of idea? So that on the 70th anniversary of Soviet power sugar, detergent and soap are rationed?"

Prodded that he "is very careful not to say anything bad about the Communist Party" Vasilyev says the definition of the party should be detailed. He then evades to reply. He says that the present policy towards the nationality issue is not the solution but the aggravation of the question, adding that in the "tsarist Russia such problems did not exist; the Russian governor turned up and decided the argument. True, he arrived with soldiers but after that the murderous bloodshed stopped."

Vasilyev claims that in 1917 only the label was changed and the Soviet state is only fiction. He claims not to understand "why our tsarism is so bad despite this." Explaining that returning to constitutional monarchy is only a matter of technicalities, he rejects that Gorbachev could be elected as tsar, adding that "Gorbachev has no sufficient firmness, he cries out for democracy, liberalism, suspicious games. The people's trust is increasingly shaken in a leader who has no concrete program"

and despite appearances to the contrary "an antipathy which is increasingly difficult to keep secret is evolving toward him." "It is in these situations that political charlatans appear—the Ivanovs, the Yeltsins, who are only pieces on the chess table, and are not what they claim to be. They are used in this democracy game." They have the opportunity to speak on radio, television, at mass meetings while the other sides are not granted these possibilities." He asks God to save Russia from Yeltsin ever being elected as president because he would be the most horrible dictator.

A tape is then played of a Pamyat speaker addressing the 8 June gathering.

Gecse next interviews an unidentified person about the republics which want to secede. The interviewee "categoricaly opposes as subtle dirty propaganda of the West" the secession of these territories—with Russian approval—which would allow Russia to set up a monarchy within its own borders, ie. the idea of Solzhenitsyn. He says the Baltics always lived under foreign tutelage and "became truly free and happly only in the Russian empire. It is incomprehensible why they abuse Russia these days. It is a different matter what happened after 1917, but Russians had no role to play in that." He then says that should the republics secede "we would count up how much they owe Russia, and the Russian people. Let them repay their debt first." Gecse says that Baltic republics claim that Russia owes them. He says the nationalist movements which want to secede from the Soviet Union are led by "chauvinists who lead their nations to the abyss." These nations are too small to be independent and "should they receive help from the West, they will become servant nations whereas today they are lords served by Russians; for in the factories the heavy manual work is done mostly by Russians."

The program continues with a tape from the meeting with an address by Nikolay Gatkov, a close Vasilyev associate. Gecse then continues the interview with Vasilyev who discusses pogroms.

CSSR's Jakes Addresses Regional Party Chiefs

PM2009143589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Sep 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "The Party Is the Guarantor of Renewal. Speech by M. Jakes"]

[Text] Prague, 16 Sep—The party is the initiator of restructuring and should be its motive force and the guarantor of its implementation in a socialist direction. It is necessary to reemphasize that restructuring is inevitable. Socialism in our country has reached a new phase in its development. This was stated by Milos Jakes, general secretary of the Czechoslovak Communist Party [CPCZ] Central Committee, in a speech to a statewide conference of the first secretaries of CPCZ regional and district committees held in Prague today.

We have still not yet fully realized in our activity, he said, that restructuring implies fundamental revolutionary transformations whose implementation demands a dogged political struggle.

The period that has elapsed has witnessed the further galvanization, thanks to the support of Western political circles and the mass media, of all kinds of illegal groups striving to jump on the bandwagon of the restructuring and democratization process and exploit it in order to destabilize socialism in our country, weaken the party's role, and discredit party activity. They are striving to overthrow the current political system in our country, M. Jakes stressed.

The development of all-around cooperation with the Soviet Union, which, under the leadership of its Communist Party, was the first to embark on the path of economic and social restructuring, is of priority importance for the CSSR. The processes of revolutionary change in Soviet society largely inspire us.

It is necessary to get the entire party and society moving, to include each individual in the implementation of our policy, and to exploit people's creative strengths, the general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee stated in conclusion.

CSSR-Albania Ties, USSR Stance Contrasted

PM1909123989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 1

[Own correspondent L. Kornilov dispatch under the "Abroad" rubric: "Prague and Tirana Await Ambassadors"]

[Excerpts] Prague—As has already been announced, the CSSR Federal Government proposed last week to normalize diplomatic relations with Albania. CTK published a report here on Thursday announcing that diplomatic relations between the two countries had been raised to the level of embassies on the basis of an accord reached by the two countries' governments.

As is well known, bilateral relations between the two countries became complicated in the sixties. Attributing its proposal to an improvement in these relations, the Czechoslovak side believes that there is now no obstacle to mutually beneficial comprehensive cooperation to the benefit of both countries' peoples on the basis of the principles of equality, respect for sovereignty, and noninterference in internal affairs.

Limited diplomatic relations were hitherto maintained between Czechoslovakia and Albania at the level of charges d'affaires (as we can see, our Czechoslovak friends have had a somewhat different attitude toward Albania from that of the Soviet Union, which has no diplomatic relations with that country). Henceforth ambassadors extraordinary and plenipotentiary will represent their countries' interests in Prague and Tirana.

The CSSR Government's proposal indisputably falls within the mainstream of socialist countries' common endeavor to revive and organize good, equal, respectful, and comradely relations with Albania and its people. And links between individual socialist community countries and that country have, correspondingly, not died out altogether. Let me recall a sentence from a travel feature entitled "Cordial Albania" published last year in IZVESTIYA. The Czechoslovak author of these comments wrote that an aircraft visits Tirana every day, "first a Hungarian, then a Yugoslav, a Romanian, a Greek, or a Swiss. There is an Interflug flight from the GDR once every 2 weeks..." [passage omitted].

The CSSR Government's new initiative, which has brought about the normalization of diplomatic relations with Albania, is an example of the modern approach to international affairs and serves as a manifestation of the new political thinking.

CPSU Group Studies Romanian Agricultural Policy

PM2009093989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Sep 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Delegation Returns"]

[Text] A delegation of party workers headed by A. Ponomarev, member of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of Belgorod party oblast committee, was in Romania 11-16 September. The delegation, which familiarized itself with the agrarian policy of the Romanian Communist Party [RCP] and its implementation, was received by V. Barbulescu, secretary of the RCP Central Committee.

West Europe

Further on Soviet Official's Disappearance in Rome

PM2209084089 Rome LA REPUBBLICA in Italian 21 Sep 89 p 13

[Unattributed report: "Senior Soviet Official Asks the United States for Asylum: Vladimir Alpenidze Disappeared From Rome Hotel 5 September"]

[Text] Rome—The disappearance in the streets of the capital of a senior Soviet official who has applied for political asylum to the U.S. Embassy in Rome is still shrouded in mystery, like in a novel by Le Carre. Vladimir Alpenidze, chairman of the All-Union Copyright Agency, a post equivalent to that of a minister, was visiting Rome with a group of fellow countrymen but vanished without trace 5 September.

Alpenidze, who was once an adviser to Edvard Shevardnadze at the time when the foreign minster was premier of the Soviet republic of Georgia, was booked into the Lux Hotel at 32, via Volturno, near the Termini railroad station. He arrived in Rome Tuesday 3 September and was due to return home 5 September. However, when his group, composed of 31 journalists, assembled in the small lobby before setting off and the tour guides held a roll call, Alpenidze was missing. His room key had not been checked in, his luggage was still in his room, and nobody had seen him since the previous evening. At this point matters become enveloped in a thick fog. The hotel porter notified Rome police headquarters that a guest had not returned to the hotel since the previous evening. Apparently the Soviet secret services immediately started searching for the official throughout the country and inquired at several police headquarters whether Alpenidze had requested political asylum in our country.

The Foreign Ministry, consulted by LA REPUBBLICA last night, announced that it had no information or explanation about what had happened to the Soviet citizen who disappeared in the capital.

Later, following reports that Alpenidze had applied for political asylum at the U.S. Embassy, a spokesman for the Soviet Embassy in Rome frankly admitted that he "was not aware of the fact."

The Alpenidze affair is reminiscent of that of another Soviet citizen, Vitaliy Yurchenko, who applied for asylum at the U.S. Embassy in Rome. In August 1985 Yurchenko, a KGB general, threw himself into the CIA's arms—he subsequently maintained that he had been kidnapped—and was later taken to Washington amid the utmost secrecy. However, 3 months later, the spy embarrassed U.S. intelligence by evading its surveillance, taking refuge in the Soviet Embassy, and returning to the USSR.

Gorbachev November Visit to Italy Confirmed

PM2109094089 Milan L'UNITA in Italian 14 Sep 89 p 9

[Unattributed report: "Gorbachev to Italy: Official Confirmation from Moscow"]

[Excerpt] Rome—Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gerasimov has given official confirmation of the Soviet president's visit to Italy. "At this stage," the spokesman said, "it will be in November." A few days ago Soviet Ambassador to Italy Lunkov, confirming the possibility of Gorbachev's meeting with Pope Wojtyla, was more specific, and said that the visit will take place "in the second half of November." [passage omitted]

Thatcher Comments on Soviet Reforms in Tokyo Talk

Lauds 'Gorbachev's Valiance'

LD2009221489 Moscow TASS in English 1929 GMT 20 Sep 89

[Text] Tokyo September 20 TASS—By TASS correspondent Vladimir Solntsev:

The fate of perestroyka in the Soviet Union will depend on the ability of the Mikhail Gorbachev administration to upgrade the standard of living in the country and meet the population's demands. A phrase to the effect was

uttered by British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher in the course of her talks today with Japanese Premier Toshiki Kaifu.

Assessing the reform processes in the Soviet Union, Thatcher who is expected for a brief stop-over in Moscow en route from Tokyo home, lauded Gorbachev's valiance and stated that more transformations have been accomplished than expected.

Thatcher noted at the same time that the Soviet leadership faces uphill work.

Sources in the Japanese Foreign Ministry told TASS that Margaret Thatcher pointed out that there are constructive and destructive politicians, the latter ones bent on critical pronouncements. But a politician should have an extensive view of things and Gorbachev's just this type of leader, she believed.

Thatcher was reported as saying that the purpose of her visit to Moscow was to proclaim support for the Soviet leader.

The parties also discussed the developments in China. Kaifu informed his British counterpart of a recent visit to China of a Japanese parliamentary delegation and of Deng Xiaoping's statement during the visit reiterating the Chinese leadership's commitment to reform.

In the course of their talks Thatcher called for consolidated efforts of all countries to avert further deterioration of the environment.

The world tends to unite when it faces unforeseen developments or is threatened, Thatcher said. This may also be the case in the present circumstances.

While discussing bilateral relations, Thatcher criticized Japan's protectionism which lead to a chronic trade deficit between that country and Great Britain and pressed for removing barriers that keep British goods out of the Japanese market and granting major British bond companies an opportunity to operate in Japan.

Calls Gorbachev's Policies 'Brave'

LD2109194489 Moscow TASS in English 1859 GMT 21 Sep 89

[Text] Tokyo September 21 TASS—By TASS correspondent Vladimir Solntsev:

British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher has described perestroyka reforms in the Soviet Union as a great, historic movement and called upon countries of the West to render maximum support for reforms in the USSR.

Speaking at a news conference here today, the British premier, who is in Japan on an official visit, gave a high evaluation to Mikhail Gorbachev's activity.

Thatcher, who will have a short working meeting with the Soviet leader during her brief stop-over in Moscow en route from Tokyo to London, recalled that the two leaders had had several previous meetings.

She said she had understood from their very first talk that Gorbachev was different from all other Soviet politicians with whom she had talked before. He can freely discuss practically any question and tackle fundamental problems very sincerely, Thatcher noted. She recalled saying at the time: "Here is a man I can do business with".

Thatcher called Gorbachev's policy brave, courageous and far-sighted and stressed that it was of truly historic scale. The prime minister pointed out that political reform in the Soviet Union has achieved more than was originally expected by many.

According to Thatcher, it is vitally important for the Soviet leadership to score economic achievements in the next few years. At the same time she noted that it takes more time to change a country economically than politically, especially when economic reform includes a transition from centralized control to greater personal enterprise and initiative.

Everything President Gorbachev tries and does in the Soviet Union, Thatcher believed, is in the interests of freedom at large and in the interests of nations which believe in the cause of democracy.

We must, therefore, do everything we can to support the great, historic movement which he initiated and must sincerely hope and do everything possible for its success, Thatcher said.

Speaking about the disarmament issue, she said that there was greater cooperation and greater hopes in many fields, but at the same time she pointed to "a period of great uncertainty ahead" and said it was not the best of times for curtailing defence.

Wars are not prevented by disarmament, she insisted, they are prevented by securing preparedness and dependable defence.

Speaks on Baltic Independence

LD2209081289 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 1900 GMT 21 Sep 89

[Text] According to Japanese Radio the British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher has said in Tokyo that the striving for independence on the part of the Soviet Baltic republics is only natural because they were illegally incorporated in the Soviet Union. Yuriy Minayev of our staff comments:

[Minayev] I agree that a striving for independence on the part of any nation is only natural, though I am not convinced the Baltic republics were incorporated in the Soviet Union illegally. The decisions taken by those republics in 1940 to join the USSR had broad public backing. As for the secret protocols attached to the Soviet-German nonaggression treaty, they were of course

immoral and are now censured here by both the public and the government. Considering all this, the Soviet Parliament this summer granted Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania wider economic and political rights. The only question is how the West, facing what the British Foreign Secretary John Major has called a historic opportunity, is going to bring about desirable changes in Eastern Europe. Mr Major, who was speaking in West Germany, also said Britain was going to give Poland financial aid, but together with advice on how to privatize firms, hold elections and run political parties. If these are conditions attached to aid, then why not call it simply an attempt to influence another country?

In speaking to the former Japanese Prime Minister Noboru Takeshita in Tokyo, Mrs Thatcher, too, said the Western nations needed to support the Soviet Union's economic reforms. Well, why not? Perestroyka has proved its benefits to the whole world as well as to the Soviet Union. However, I don't believe that extremist nationalistic aspirations, which have already caused plenty of trouble not just in the USSR but in Britain too, can contribute to imporving the situation in any country. Moreover, it is very difficult and even dangerous to speak now about redrawing any borders in Europe. This would be highly destabilizing and could have unpredictable consequences, and this certainly could not help to solve complicated problems. The Soviet and the British governments have plenty of common ground on which to develop their relations in the interests of their peoples. Those interests would certainly not be served by meddling in each other's domestic affairs. Indeed, when rounding up her visit to Japan, Mrs Thatcher was asked a question about a certain aspect of American-Japanese relations. I think, Mrs Thatcher said, you are asking me to interfere rather a lot in U.S.-Japan relations. A reasonable answer, but it also prompts the reasonable follow-up question: Is there more reason to interfere in other countries' affairs?

Soviet-UK Ties Experts View Forthcoming Summit

LD2209064289 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 1900 GMT 21 Sep 89

[Text] [Announcer] President Mikhail Gorbachev will have a short working meeting with the British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher next Saturday [23 September]. On the eve of the meeting Radio Moscow's (Oleg Shchedrov) met with the man in charge of the Soviet Foreign Ministry's Second European Department, Nikolay Uspenskiy, and his deputy, (Valeriy Krusnov), an expert on Soviet- British relations. What is the aim of the forthcoming meeting?

[Uspenskiy, in Russian, fading into English translation] Almost 6 months have passed, says Nikolay Uspenskiy, since President Gorbachev paid an official visit to Britain. More problems have come to face Europe and the rest of the world since then, so there's a need for a get-together to syncronize watches and determine positions (?and) possible areas of cooperation in the more pressing international problems.

Many events have occured in this country over these 6 months. Mrs. Thatcher is a consistent supporter of perestroyka and she definitely wants first hand information.

[Announcer] At their meeting last April Gorbachev and Mrs. Thatcher agreed on regular summit contacts. The British premier's forthcoming visit, I understand, is in keeping with this agreement. Could you spell out the key parameters of the Soviet-British dialogue and its more fruitful areas?

[Unidentified speaker in Russian, fading into English translation] The dialogue has become much more energetic (?than) out(?going) exchange of views that proved poles apart sometimes. It's now aimed at revealing opportunities for joint action to solve pressing problems. Our two nations boast a good deal of understanding as far as global tasks are concerned.

[Announcer] Nikolay Uspenskiy recalled the important role Britain had played when the Soviet Union and the United States hammered out the INF Treaty. He underscored British-Soviet cooperation on conventional weapons in Europe and chemical weapons too. He said there were signs of regional conflicts being resolved by cooperative effort.

[Uspenskiy] I'm not trying to make the impression we've minimized difficulties. They do exist, in particular where the present day role of nuclear weapons is concerned. Such difficulties necessitate dialogue rather than war propaganda.

[Announcer] Valeriy (Krusnov) spoke next.

[(Krusnov), in Russian, fading into English translation] The Soviet Union and Britain are expanding cooperation on combatting terrorism, AIDS, drug addiction, and other global problems. There are signs of remarkable ecological cooperation. This shows Soviet-British relations have made notable headway and political will has (?united) both nations' potentials to solve global as well as national problems.

[Announcer] Unfortunately there are some unpleasant things to be mentionesd on the eve of the summit. Last May Britain asked 11 Soviet officials to return home. Moscow did the same. This triggered the question of quotas on the strength of missions in the two capitals. What is the situation like now? Valeriy (Krusnov) deplored Britain's virtual quota of 205 on the Soviet representatives in London. Actions of this kind, he emphasized, clashed with the general atmosphere of Soviet-British ties, and elaborated.

[(Krusnov)] Both the time and the situation have changed. The Soviet side was forced to opt for parity and impose adequate restrictions on the British personnel. This move must signal that force is unacceptable to the

Soviet Union. We understand our restrictions are not to the liking of the British diplomats, businessmen, or newsmen in Moscow. They must have drawn similar response from the British public. I'd like to use this opportunity to say that if the situation is to be settled, one condition must be met, the trust that Soviet-British relations enjoy must spread to their inveterate (?field).

[Announcer] Can many crises of this kind visibly cloud Soviet-British relations? We'd like to believe they cannot. Our two nations have gone a long way over the (?past few) years to remove political vestiges though dialogue and discussion. Let's hope summits can help rid Soviet-British relations of problems of this kind.

France's Marchais Arrives in Moscow; Met by Falin

LD2209022689 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1657 GMT 21 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow, 21 Sep (TASS)—At the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee, Georges Marchais, general secretary of the French Communist Party, arrived in Moscow today. At the airport, Marchais and those accompanying him were met by Valentin Falin, head of the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee, and senior members of the CPSU Central Committee.

Latin America & Caribbean

Omelichev Reaffirms End of Nicaraguan Arms Link

LD2109101889 Moscow TASS in English 1006 GMT 21 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 21 TASS—The Soviet Union has not supplied weapons to Nicaragua since 1988, a high-ranking Soviet Armed Forces staff officer told TASS today.

Bronislav Omelichev, first deputy chief of the General Staff, described U.S. allegations about the growth of Soviet arms deliveries to Nicaragua in 1989 as "contradicting reality."

General Omelichev emphasised that the Soviet Union in principle advocates the use of political methods of settling regional conflicts.

The USSR is firmly committed to a political settlement in Central America.

"The Soviet Government has expressed its determination to honour the Central American countries' accords on a peaceful settlement in Central America and, within the framework of its responsibility for the preservation of peace, facilitate the implementation of these accords," he said.

U.S. 'Ready To Send' Military Adivsers in Drug War

PM1509110189 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 12 Sep 89 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "United States Ready"]

[Text] Washington, 11 Sep—The United States is ready to send its military advisers to Peru and Bolivia to assist in the campaign against the drug cartels in these countries. W. Bennett, coordinator of the administration's anti-drug campaign, stated this on ABC-TV news. At the same time, he denied a report in THE WASHINGTON POST about the existence of a secret administration plan to send U.S. special forces into Latin America to participate directly in military operations against drug gangs. "We do not have such a plan," Bennett stated.

The report on the possibility of U.S. armed forces taking part in military operations against the drug producers cartel provoked a negative reaction in the U.S. Congress.

Commentator Views U.S. Aid to El Salvador

PY2009140289 Moscow in Spanish to Latin America 2300 GMT 19 Sep 89

[By Leonid Levchenko]

[Text] A U.S. Department of State spokesman has indicated that Washington proposes to continue helping the Salvadoran regime until the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front [FMLN] combatants surrender their arms.

The timing of this statement is remarkable. Let us recall that less than 1 week ago representatives of the rebel forces and the Salvadoran Government met in Mexico, thus launching a dialogue aimed at a national reconciliation. The parties (?agreed) to continue these talks in Costa Rica on 16 and 17 October, however, even the first round of talks in Mexico showed that continuing the war was pointless because neither of the parties is capable of militarily defeating the other. Thus, the only possible victory for all is the victory of common sense. This can be achieved only through national dialogue. The rebels have correctly made it clear that no preconditions can be set for continuing dialogue, and less still can it be demanded that the FMLN combatants should unilaterally surrender their arms.

It should be noted this demand is being made while the Salvadoran Government is getting considerable military aid from the United States and, according to the Department of State spokesman, it has no plans to discontinue this aid.

The Salvadoran military is using U.S.-made weapons only against the rebels and not against any foreign enemy. It is well known that throughout the 10 years of civil war in El Salvador, the United States has supplied almost $4 billion worth of military and nonmilitary aid

to that country. Thanks to this assistance, 70,000 Salvadorans have been killed and over 1 million people have had to leave the country to save their lives.

We can see that additional U.S. military aid will inflict further untold suffering and misfortunes on the Salvadoran people. Putting an end to this assistance and to any further interference in Salvadoran domestic affairs would help dispel mutual distrust and would create in the country an atmosphere favorable to national dialogue. Washington's demands that the rebels should surrender their arms as a precondition for Washington to reconsider the issue of military aid to the Salvadoran regime represents, as far as I am concerned, unacceptable interference in El Salvador's domestic affairs.

Undoubtedly, the process of national reconciliation must take place free of any foreign interference whatsoever. I would like to quote Joaquin Villalobos, a rebel leader, who told THE NEW YORK TIMES that the end of U.S. military aid to the Salvadoran regime would lead to an immediate end to the war.

Salvadoran President Deviates From Agreements

LD2009112889 Moscow TASS in English 1041 GMT 20 Sep 89

["Salvadoran Authorities Impede Peace Process in El Salvador"—TASS headline]

[Text] Havana September 20 TASS—The Central American mass media has regarded the intention of Salvadoran President Alfredo Cristiani to continue negotiations with the Farabundo Marti national Liberation Front [FMLN] within the framework of the existing constitution as a deviation from recent agreements with the rebels.

The intention is outlined in a statement made by the president in repsonse to the rebel proposal to give up the armed struggle and join the political life if the army cleans up its ranks, if repressions are stopped, elections to municipal and legislative bodies are held earlier than 1991 and if the election system is reformed.

According to the Salvadoran mass media, this package of proposals will be dominate the FMLN talks with the Salvadoran government in Costa Rica in October.

At the same time, the Salvadoran police have staged another act of violence in San Salvador. Special police units dispersed a demonstration organised by the Federation of Salvadoran Trade Unions in protest against the arrest of 12 activists of workers' and peasant organisations. About 100 demonstrators sheltered in a cathedral. But, the police smashed the cathedral's windows and shot tear gas into the building. Policemen also opened fire and army helicopters circled over the cathedral.

Despite the fact that many people inside were wounded, the police did not allow Red Cross representatives to approach the cathedral, as demonstrators demanded.

About 60 demonstrators were first brutally beaten and then arrested, the San Salvadoran mass media said.

Radio Disputes 'Panamanian Resistance' Interview

PY2109145389 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Spanish to Latin America 0300 GMT 20 Sep 89

[Text] Television Channel 7 in Costa Rica has aired an interview with a self-styled representative of the so-called Panamanian resistance. This interview has created a strange impression and has elicited contradictory reactions.

The press has reported that David, the name used by the representative in question, is merely an alias. He never once faced the cameras. He did show, however, his true political colours. The fake David came across as a rabid anticommunist and stated that he had been a member of the Nicaraguan resistance and had fought against Castro.

According to David, the so-called Panamanian resistance has 1,200 volunteers who will shortly launch an armed struggle to overthrow General Manuel Antonio Noriega as commander of the Panamanian Defense Forces. Speaking Spanish with a Latin American accent, David bragged that Noriega's days are numbered.

The Spanish news agency EFE decided to learn some more about this and got in touch with certain Costa Rican politicians. The latter told EFE that the communique released by the fake David could be merely a maneuver by the Panamanian regime aimed at justifying its actions against the opposition which says that it has made it very clear that it plans to use only peaceful means against the Panamanian Government. The latter claim is arguable:

1. The Panamanian opposition is hardly as harmless as it claims to be. We could mention the disturbances that the opposition goons created during the so-called national cruzade prior to and during the elections, forcing the government to annul the elections.

2. None of the opposition parties or groups can supply firm evidence that the government has used force against its opponents. Even in the United States, the country that brags that it is the model of democracy, the Watergate affair is far from being the only case of its kind.

In view of the widespread belief that General Noriega is staging a provocation against the Panamanian opposition, we would like to draw our listeners' attention to one aspect of the interview with the fake David. He said that his armed gang is training in specific locations in Panama, that it has no bases in Costa Rica and that he is legally in Costa Rica. However, it is well known that Costa Rican laws expressly forbid any organization that advocates terrorist actions against [word indistinct] governments from remaining in Costa Rican territory. Therefore, David lied. Why did he lie? Obviously to sow confusion.

Lately the Costa Rican press has been reporting that [word indistinct] agents are training mercenaries in this country, to later launch them against Panama's legitimate government. For [words indistinct] years now the Yankee government has been directing all its might at Panama, seeking to overthrow its government and topple Noriega from his military post. So far it has been unsuccessful. In view of this, it seems that it became necessary to use CIA mercenaries, one of whom is this David person.

Political & Social

PRAVDA Account of 19 Sep CPSU Plenum Debate

PM2109094989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Sep 89 Second Edition pp 1-7

[TASS report: "On the Basis of Leninist Principles, Toward a New Quality of Interethnic Relations. Debate at CPSU Central Committee Plenum"]

[Text] Cardinal questions of perestroyka and of the life of the party and the people were discussed 19 September at the CPSU Central Committee Plenum. After listening to the speech and report by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, the plenum participants adopted a resolution on convening the 28th party congress and embarked on a debate on the CPSU's nationalities policy in contemporary conditions.

R.Kh. Khabibullin, first secretary of the Bashkir CPSU Oblast Committee [Obkom], mounted the rostrum. The republic's Communists and all its working people, he said, have greeted the draft CPSU platform on the nationalities question with sincere interest and approval. Particularly great satisfaction is evoked by the chief idea of the document—reviving the Leninist concept of the Soviet federation as a union of free and equal people.

The Bashkir Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic [ASSR] is a unique multinational region. Chuvash, Mari, Ukrainians, Mordvinians, Udmurts, Belorussians, Nenets, Jews, Letts, and representatives of more than 70 nationalities live there in dense groups alongside Bashkirs, Russians, and Tatars. Relying on the rich internationalist traditions existing in the republic, party organizations seek to conduct purposeful work to harmonize interethnic relations. Taking into account the opinions of the broad public, the CPSU Obkom has formulated a comprehensive program for strengthening international and patriotic education. Measures are being taken to remove disproportions in the siting of productive forces and to even up the level of socioeconomic development of various rayons. Schools in which teaching is conducted in indigenous languages are being restored and much is being done to satisfy national cultural requirements.

We see one of the main tasks as being to persistently establish in people a sense of national dignity and pan-Soviet pride. Life is putting forward more and more new tasks which cannot be resolved without further improvement of the Soviet federation. We believe that the draft CPSU platform does not contain any breakthrough from established views and leaves untouched the hierarchical structure of the national state system.

It does not take full account of the profound socioeconomic and cultural shifts that have taken place in the autonomous republics. Though it surpasses the majority of union republics in terms of the per capita volume of national income and industrial output, Bashkiria nevertheless lags far behind them in social development. Among the 71 Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] oblasts, krays, and autonomous republics, the Bashkir ASSR occupies places between the fifties and the seventies in terms of these indicators.

This injustice has arisen because 97 percent of industrial enterprises on Bashkiria's territory are under union or union republic jurisdiction, and only 3 percent are under local jurisdiction. Those 3 percent form almost 90 percent of our republic's budget.

Autonomous republic status creates literally insurmountable barriers in resolving national and cultural questions. Here is a comparison: Estonia has a population 2.5 times smaller than Bashkiria's, yet 105 magazines and other periodicals are published there. We have just 10, and in terms of per capita publication of books we lag behind our Estonian comrades by a factor of 28. In Bashkiria local television is permitted to broadcast for only 3 hours per day, whereas in union republics broadcast time is many times longer. Nor do we have any movie studio of our own.

The unequal legal status also infringes the political rights of the peoples of the autonomous republic. Bashkiria, with its population of 4 million, is represented in the country's supreme organ of state power by far fewer deputies than a number of union republics with considerably smaller populations.

Thus whatever sphere you take—the socioeconomic, political, or ideological sphere or culture—everywhere we run up against the limitations of the existing structure of the federation. This inevitably causes friction in interethnic relations and devalues the party's nationalities policy at local level.

During the discussion of the draft platform the republic's working people, public, and party committees persistently spoke out on the need to transform the Bashkir ASSR into a union republic and to constitutionally enshrine this status. This would be a powerful stimulus to the efficient development of productive forces and the spiritual rebirth of the peoples.

This is not a new question. Back during the discussion of the 1936 draft USSR Constitution proposals were expressed regarding the possibility of transforming the Bashkir and Tatar ASSR's into union republics. But at that time the only formal obstacle was the fact that they lack external borders. Life has proved the artificiality of this condition. Bashkiria's working people have no intention of ever departing anywhere. They have lived and continue to live in a united harmonious family and have always been and continue to be friendly with their good neighbors.

We are taking the first steps along the road of forming a federative rule-of-law state guaranteeing free and equal development of all nations. It is hard to assess the behavior of those who are irresponsibly bandying separatist slogans as anything but reckless. Economic and cultural ties between republics have taken shape over the

decades. Millions of human lives are closely interwoven. And it is impossible to cut everything with a single stroke. That would be a real tragedy, especially for those who would be quitting our union. It is also tremendously damaging to all the Soviet peoples. The unified national economic complex existing in the USSR is an objective reality. For the sake of future generations, we cannot allow it to be dragged off into national compartments.

The speaker went on to note that the further improvement of interethnic relations is impossible without cardinal measures in the system of economic management and the introduction of regional economic accountability.

Pointing out that through the fault of central ministries and departments and the local leadership, Bashkiria, possessing incalculable natural resources, has essentially been transformed into a raw material appendage and has lagged drastically behind many regions in terms of social development, the speaker stressed: Our working people are refusing to tolerate this situation any longer. This is why their desire to switch to the principles of economic accountability is so ardent.

During the preparations for the plenum problems of interethnic relations were vigorously raised by the mass news media. The press, television, and radio conducted an extensive discussion of the CPSU platform, and many materials substantially enriched party theory and practice on the nationalities question. But the pages of the press are often literally swamped by a stream of negative dispatches and all our ideological and moral gains are erased. Newspapers, the speaker pointed out, have written extremely little about the multifaceted links between Soviet republics, about the life and work of international collectives, and about party organizations' experience of improving interethnic relations.

Certain publications are continuing to make much of the errors once made by someone in questions of nationalities policy. The authors of such pieces try yet again to accuse the leaders of party organs of every possible sin and to call them insulting names under the guise of pluralism of opinions. There are distortions of the facts and an incorrect interpretation of the state of affairs in interethnic relations is provided.

The MOLODAYA GVARDIYA Publishing House recently published a book by Romarenko entitled "On the Trail of the Snowman" [Po sledam snezhnogo cheloveka] about the causes of nationalism in the USSR. His arguments are astonishingly categorical. For instance, concerning Bashkiria, he accuses an entire nation of chauvinism. And this is claimed by someone who lacks even an elementary idea of our region and is totally ignorant of what the situation is like there or of what interests govern the lives of its united multinational family.

Such arguments are nothing other than direct incitement of interethnic conflicts and an attempt to sow discord between people.

No one, the speaker continued, is permitted to kindle unhealthy passions leading to the political destabilization of society. The force of the law must be resolutely applied to those who deliberately inflame the situation. This was very well said in M.S. Gorbachev's report. But I would like to hope that what was said will be implemented in real life, and will not remain just talk.

A number of publications in the center and at local level are literally competing to denigrate the Russian people. We resolutely condemn this nationalist outburst. It represents malicious intent and black ingratitude. Life has never pampered the Russian people. Throughout all adversity and trials they have sustained and carefully preserved their best qualities—kindness, selflessness, and industriousness.

The draft platform again enshrines the unequal status of the RSFSR compared to the other republics. The report contains specific proposals on improving the management of the RSFSR, and these will be of considerable benefit.

A complex and contradictory process is taking place in our Soviet home. It is very important to counter passions and emotions with reason and presence of mind, with principledness and firmness. History has entrusted us with the responsible mission of preserving and strengthening the revolution's greatest achievement—the USSR. It is our lofty patriotic duty to emerge with honor from the present trials, to determine the optimum paths of our multinational homeland's further development, and to safeguard its might and unity for us all.

Ye.Ye. Sokolov, first secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee, took the floor.

I share the thought, he said, that throughout the period of perestroyka we have not had a more complex, more acute, or more significant problem for our society than the one we are discussing today. The overwhelming majority of Soviet Belorussia's Communists and working people firmly advocate—as the results of the discussion of the draft platform of the party's contemporary nationalities policy indicate—renewing our common home and filling its potential with real democratic and humanist content.

Any union of people is strong and robust thanks to the strength and robustness of the community's real prospects and thanks to its economic, potential, and moral possibilities, the speaker emphasized. Therefore we link the future of society not only with the growth of national awareness but also with the truly international unity of all nations and ethnic groups.

In this connection, when defining the strategic tasks of the party's nationalities policy under contemporary conditions and shaping an integral concept of interethnic relations, it is expedient, first, to resolve in greater depth questions connected with achieving the international unity of nations and ethnic groups by realizing their

creative potential, through the diversity of features of national originaly, and through mutual enrichment.

Second, it is necessary to forecast more carefully the possible consequences not only of particular proposals but also of individual formulas. Without the art of forecasting there is no policy.

When we began perestroyka, the speaker continued, did we think that in just over 4 years' time we would have such glaring problems in various spheres of social life? But, on the other hand, it is a total illusion to suppose that perestroyka is not a struggle, not a daily surmounting of difficulties, not a path on which mistakes too are possible. You have to pay for everything, as the saying goes, including for renewal. But, given profound, well thought-out, and comprehensively weighed forecasting, the price can be far less. Take such a key problem of the humanization of federative relations as the mutual delegating of rights and obligations between the union and the republics. It was covered convincingly both in M.S. Gorbachev's report and in the draft platform. I would like, however, also to express this view. Can the republics' right to secede from the USSR be of an absolute nature? For each republic has obligations to other republics and to the country as a whole. In my view, free secession from the USSR must not infringe the sovereign rights of other republics. It can happen only on condition that it will harm neither them nor the union as a whole.

The interpretation of the economic substance of self-determination and sovereignty as the republics' transfer to economic accountability and self-financing does not seem quite accurate either. The most important problem here is the right to ownership of land and what lies beneath it—timber, water, and other natural riches and resources.

Is there not a certain lack of agreement and imprecision in the point in the draft which assigns natural riches to the republics, but to the union the right to define all-union principles governing their use? For it has not been ruled out that the center, in the form of ministries and departments, can define such principles and that the republics' rights will become an empty formality.

Moreover, in this situation, the speaker believes, neither the republics nor the union possess the triad of powers of possession, disposal, and use which characterizes the right of ownership. The approach to the problem is seen as somewhat different. In a really democratic, rule-of-law federative state—and precisely this is what we seek—such strategic elements as the possession and disposal of natural resources must come within the sphere of general competence of both the union and the republics, the speaker said.

At the same time the USSR Supreme Soviet must, in his opinion, unambiguously define the degree of autonomy of republic ownership with regard to union ownership. And the republic supreme soviets will in turn define the degree of dependence of oblast ownership on republic ownership, while the oblast soviets will do this with regard to city and rayon ownership.

The speaker called this a fundamental question, because both supercentralism and superregionalism are equally pernicious and dangerous for the humanization of interethnic relations. In Belorussia there are 288 enterprises of union subordination. They employ 726,000 people, or 58 percent of all the people working in industry. But their contribution to the republic budget stands at just 8.5 percent. People say: Given this situation, however hard you try, there will not be more hospitals, consumer enterprises, stores, or goods. Union ministries will take almost all the income. Hence the splurges of emotion, the temptation to succumb to pseudorevolutionary separatist slogans, and the quest for so-called "scapegoats." Cadres locally are faced with considerable work to prevent heated passions and to convince people of the fundamental wrongness and erroneousness of the thinking whose starting position is an artificial division into "them" at the center and "us" locally. This is why the model of territorial economic accountability, the speaker continued, has been based on the creation of a mechanism which harmoniously combines the interests of labor collectives and all involved in the production sphere with the interests of the republic and the country as a whole.

At the union level, the speaker believes, only management of those complexes and sectors that are of determining significance in the functioning of the country's economy as a single whole must be preserved. These are the fuel and energy complex, metallurgy, the chemical industry, the defense sectors, individual forms of transport, ecology, and so forth.

Speaking of the desire of a number of union departments to retain other sectors when the republic switches to economic accountability, the speaker said that this is nothing but an attempted show of force by those who can in no way reconcile themselves to a change in the old procedures. Wherever there is talk of going over to self-management, even this talk itself is accompanied almost by euphoria. The republics and regions always used to agree even minor questions with the center, but now they are their own bosses. Your head could easily get in a spin? There is no need to fear, self-management will not make your head spin, and nothing bad will happen—until centrifugal trends start to manifest themselves. Of course, this danger should not be exaggerated. But nor must it be belittled.

The negative experience of a number of countries attests, the speaker continued, that decentralization of the economy, if you let this process slide, can give rise to both egocentric and nationalist behavior. Therefore, he said, at the same time as going over to self-management and resolving many related questions, we are taking a number of measures to prevent manifestations of egocentrism. It is better to anticipate and prevent negative processes than to let them spread and then make an

incredible effort to eliminate them, which is to be observed in interethnic relations.

Or strikes, let us say. At the recent All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions [AUCCTU] plenum they were called a strong argument in defense of working people's interests. The idea of the possible use of this argument in the future was also aired. Let us be frank, comrades. Which way are we going when we justify the participation of Communists, leaders, and people's deputies in strikes? What are we encouraging? A responsible attitude toward the matter? A desire for highly productive labor or freeloading? Will you find many labor collectives, rayons, or cities in the country that do not have grounds for discontent? Today it is impossible to visit the rayons that suffered from the Chernobyl accident. People ask many questions: What happened in the regions where strikes took place? Earthquakes? Floods? Or an explosion at nuclear stations? Did we inhabitants of Gomel Oblast or Mogilev Oblast reduce these regions to such a state? Why were those who contributed to this not called strictly to account? Why has personal responsibility not become the norm in our work? Why is responsibility shifted increasingly frequently onto the whole party or onto its cadres as a whole? People also ask at whose expense benefits have been established for a number of regions. Such injustice, whereby the demands—not of a person who has suffered because of someone's criminal thoughtlessness and who is patient and maintains restraint and courage, but of those who use strong-arm methods—are encouraged and satisfied, does not help to unite people, but disunites them.

I particularly want to talk about the status, the position of the republican communist parties, the speaker continued. The Communists of Soviet Belorussia, with the odd exception, the speaker said, reject the idea of transforming the CPSU into a confederation of union republican parties and are resolutely in favor of its unity as a guarantee of perestroyka and national rebirth. Of course, each republican party organization can have its own program, but it should be based on the fundamental principles of the CPSU Program and the party's common goals and take into account the republic's distinctive features and its specific political, national-cultural, socioeconomic, and other tasks.

As for the CPSU Statutes, here, he said, our view is unequivocal. The basic law of party life must be common to all Communists, wherever they live and whatever nationality they belong to. I do not agree with those who want to bury the principle of democratic centralism, the speaker said. Of course, the formula needs to be clarified and amplified in view of the new conditions in which the party is operating. A return to the principles of democratic centralism as Lenin understood them will make it possible to strengthen the creative potential of party organizations and all Communists and will intensify the quest for nonstandard ways of solving problems, and, consequently, will radically enhance cadres' responsibility for the ongoing processes.

In his speech Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee First Secretary A.M. Masaliyev noted that the plenum is discussing one of the fundamental questions of the party's and state's activity—a new nationalities policy at a turning point in society's development. It is of immense significance for a state such as ours, he said. And the fate of perestroyka and the international well-being of our multinational fatherland will depend on it, on what kind of policy we devise and how we implement it.

Concerning the state of interethnic relations, the speaker stressed that Soviet people are seriously worried about it. The nationalities question has always been complex, but particularly so today, now that it has been exacerbated to the limit under the influence of various factors and is entering an impasse in some regions. In this sphere, the CPSU draft platform and M.S. Gorbachev's report at the plenum, the speaker believes, are a good basis for a detailed exchange of opinions and for the elaboration of a comprehensive and balanced party nationalities policy.

These documents are a clear guide for party and soviet organs and public organizations to its practical implementation. The platform has the approval of the public and broad sections of working people. When finalized, in the speaker's opinion, it will fully ensure the free and equal development of all the country's peoples and the strengthening of friendship, trust, and cooperation between them. Provided, of course, the republics and peoples sincerely want it, get together, and pool their efforts.

We support the platform's idea on ways to further develop and improve the Soviet federation, which has essentially demonstrated its viability, the speaker went on to say.

Despite all the mistakes and errors during the years of Soviet power, all the republics and autonomous formations have reached a new level of development and are linked to one another by thousands of threads. To sever them would be, so to speak, to cut into a living organism. This would only cause the peoples suffering. At the same time, it would be advisable to elaborate and adopt a special law on the USSR and its entities [subyekty], which would concretize and develop the constitutional norms of national-state building. The law would reflect the principle of the formation of a federation, the correlation between the rights of the USSR and the rights of the union republics, and the legal status of union and autonomous formations. In view of the fact that the Soviet federation is based on the Leninist principles of the republics' totally voluntary participation and equality and the preservation of their sovereignty, the following should be added to the draft platform, the speaker believes: "The union republics, through their plenipotentiary representatives and in accordance with the procedure laid down by Union legislation, will also participate in the solution of questions under Union jurisdiction."

The speaker stressed the need to take into account the fact that there has been indifference toward ethnic distinctiveness and that many social problems remain unresolved and are having an unhealthy effect on ethnic self-awareness, giving rise to a sense of grievance. As an example, he cited specific instances from life in Kirghizia: The preponderance of raw material and extraction sectors in the economy and the relative cheapness of products leaving the republic.

As a result the republic has a considerable revenue shortfall, which, in turn, has an adverse effect on the people's living standard. When the draft platform is finalized, the speaker said, these questions should be taken into account and measures should be envisaged to eliminate any imbalances in the structure of the regional economies. Errors in specialization have cause the level of development of the working class and skilled cadres, above all those of indigenous nationality, to lag behind. Yet this is an indicator of a nation's social maturity. Of the working class people employed in industry 27 percent are from the indigenous population, whereas the figure for agriculture is 75 percent; there are definite differences between working people's living conditions. But we cannot solve this complex task without the participation of the relevant union organs.

It must be wrong, it was stressed in the speech, when, as happened last year, enterprises under union jurisdiction, producing more than 36 percent of the overall volume of industrial output, contribute to the republican budget only 3.7 percent of the amount placed in the departmental coffers. Hence the lack of housing, children's preschool establishments, and general educational schools, the poor standard of medical and municipal services, and citizens' dissatisfaction with the activity of central and local organs. This problem is directly connected with the employment of the able-bodied population. One could have brought into social production right now over 100,000 people who do not work anywhere.

It is with a feeling of alarm and anguish that the working people of Kirghizstan, the speaker continued, are following the development of events in the Soviet Baltic republics, which is described with concern and in a principled way in the CPSU Central Committee Statement. The tension remains in some other regions. Many members of people's fronts and movements have adopted an unseemly stance. In this connection, he said that it is time to express a clear and firm opinion on such formations and alliances and to call to order those who are already acting publicly against our system and our unity, are sabotaging perestroyka, and are abusing democracy.

It is abnormal, the speaker stressed, when you have a situation where certain USSR people's deputies and members of the intelligentsia often act as soloists in these associations. One is bound to be worried by calls for the transformation of the CPSU into an alliance of independent parties and for a multiparty system and relaxation of party discipline. These are all extremely dangerous and destructive trends and they must be resolutely rebuffed both in the center and locally. On behalf of the republic's Communists, the Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee first secretary supported the platform provision to the effect that the CPSU is and will continue to be international in its composition, ideologically and organizationally united, and built on the Leninist principles of democratic centralism with a common Program and Statutes.

The speaker touched also on problems of press activity. In his view, it is doing a great deal and helping to solve complex questions. At the same time, some media, instead of engaging in honest, vigorous organizational and propaganda activity for the good of socialism, are in a number of cases intent on discrediting it.

Their treatment of problems of interethnic relations is a great mess and they are casting aspersions on entire peoples, yet each careless accusation against any people causes irreparable damage to the common cause. The press—a powerful party weapon—is operating in a biased manner. Recently it has essentially stopped paying attention to the patriotic and international education of young people, love of the motherland, and respect for the older generation and it writes little or nothing about leading production workers, ordinary working people, innovative specialists, Communists, and positive advances in the regions.

Certain people are trying to use the process of democratization and openness to break down our party system in order to remove the party from power. They are given a helping hand by certain leaders of the media, who give them space in newspapers and journals and on the screen to attack all those who do not agree with them and to revile the party and the apparatus. And it is absolutely intolerable when certain members of the intelligentsia approve and support rallies and strikes, predict impending "disaster," invoke crisis and revolution from below, and holler about saving perestroyka, urging the capitalist countries to help. They themselves are doing practically nothing to rectify the situation in the economy, the social sphere, and the consumer market. Their aims are obvious to us. Above all they want to undermine the foundations of the Soviet system.

Under these conditions we are all obliged, while developing democracy, to strengthen party, state, and civic discipline in every possible way, to enhance cadre responsibility, and to show wisdom and simultaneously promptness in our approaches. We must strive for a situation in which words are not at odds with actions and our economic and political reforms start producing returns more quickly.

Yu.N. Yelchenko, secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, who spoke later, stressed: The situation persistently demands that the plenum elaborate general guidelines for the practical resolution of the urgent issues of the development of Soviet nations

and the strengthening of the USSR as a united multinational state. Interethnic conflicts and intrigues by frankly nationalist and anti-Soviet forces in a number of parts of the country have already led to dangerous social tension and serious political and economic losses. These are not only not abating, but are continuing to expand and are acquiring different forms—from strikes to actual armed clashes.

The future of our common home—the Soviet Union, our federation, for which V.I. Lenin struggled so persistently—is in jeopardy. We will not give in to confusion or panic. The protection of socialist ideals and the strengthening of friendship among the peoples have become the paramount concern of party organizations, and they are rebuffing ethnic careerists and antisocialist forces increasingly resolutely. People are starting to see the extremists' real goals more clearly and to realize the abyss toward which they are being pushed. The consolidation of all healthy forces is undoubtedly being promoted by the assessments contained in the CPSU Central Committee Statement on the Situation in the Soviet Baltic Republics and in M.S. Gorbachev's talks with the Baltic republic leaders. Party committees, Communists, and working people in our republic support the CPSU Central Committee's position.

The speaker alluded to the experience of the first revolutionary years. It is important, he said, that nationalism be called nationalism, that chauvinism be called chauvinism, and that counterrevolution be called counterrevolution. And this should be done in a principled fashion, without any fudging.

Over the past few months, the speaker said, the volume of industrial production in our republic has decreased, and there has been no substantial improvement with regard to meeting people's urgent needs and requirements. At the party report and election meetings that are being held Communists and working people are trenchantly and fairly criticizing republic and union organs for their shortcomings in administration and their inability to change the state of affairs. We cannot fail to agree with this view of the question. And yet, for information purposes, I would like to inform the plenum that this year the Ukraine has had a good harvest, which will make it possible to improve the situation in the agrarian sector of the economy and, consequently—and this is something I would particularly like to emphasize—to increase food stocks in our republic and the whole country. New economic management methods are beginning to operate, albeit slowly. Cadres are learning about socialist enterprise.

One of the most important signs of the spread of perestroyka processes in the republic is the powerful growth in national self-awareness. The problems of the republic's state and legal status, and, above all, the safeguarding [obespecheniye] of its sovereignty are at the center of attention.

As has been noted, the strategic thrust of the party's nationalities policy is to organically combine national and international interests and values. Hence the practical task of defining the respective powers of the union and the republics extremely clearly. The proposals on the powers [kompetentsiya] of the union are correct, in the speaker's view. They accord with the interests of our multinational state and its position in the world. In this regard we should note yet again the supreme responsibility of all republics to ensure the unswerving fulfillment of our common obligations with regard to the state's defense capability and the safeguarding of the Soviet people's peaceful work.

As for the powers of union republics, they should be scrupulously thought through. We should eradicate the inaccuracies contained in the current USSR Constitution.

Of course, the nub of the problem is the restoration of the Leninist principle of national self-determination. It should be very clearly stipulated that our union is a voluntary community of peoples which have made an equally voluntary commitment to constantly strengthen that community. That is why we need as an organic part of the USSR Constitution a new declaration on the USSR to provide a comprehensive foundation for the essence of our federation, which should be primarily based on the unity of our multinational socialist family.

Talking about the republic's economic sovereignty, the speaker noted that justifiable hopes are being pinned on the implementation of regional economic accountability. And we should adopt a concept of such economic accountability which would ensure the fulfillment of our common, key task—the improvement of the entire country's economy—and would strengthen its single national economic complex. Nowadays it is not enough to recognize the pernicious influence of the one-sided industrial or agrarian regional development which we inherited from the past. We need radical, structural changes in the economy and a new scale and pace for this work in the people's interests.

There have been complex and ambiguous clashes on the questions of national-cultural needs and interests, and the maintenance of each people's ethnic originality. And it is very right that this is the sphere in which it is planned to expand the union republics' rights as much as possible. This will make it possible to resolve many problems which sometimes become highly acute—namely, the formation and transformation of institutions of culture and the arts and educational establishments, the determination of the status of a national language, the changing of the network and structure of the mass media, and so forth.

Of course, we need to act in this area in as balanced and sensible a way as possible, by no means closing our eyes to manifestations of ethnic narrow-mindedness or ethnic arrogance. Take the language problem, for instance. While supporting the idea of state national languages in

the republics, we unconditionally advocate that Russian—the language of interethnic communication, which has essentially become the common state language—be further developed and that there be de jure and de facto equality between Ukrainian and Russian, as well as for the languages of all other nationalities whose representatives live in the republic. The discussion of the draft law on languages in the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR], which was published in early September this year and reflects this principled position, shows that the intelligentsia, workers, kolkhoz members, and representatives of all nations and ethnic groups support it on the whole.

There is the separate question of those nationalities of which there is a high concentration in the republic—Bulgarians, Hungarians, Greeks, Jews, Moldavians, Poles, and Gagauzes. The ways that have been proposed to meet their national and cultural needs and requirements seem on the whole to be correct. In the history of the Soviet Ukraine there have been both national rayons and rural and settlement national soviets. Currently in the republic there are 8 rayons, around 100 rural soviets, and 150 villages in which the majority of the population is made up of citizens from one or other of the said nationalities.

Taking account of historic experience and modern conditions, we in the republic are working out proposals on the setting up of national-administrative formations. That is why it is important to stipulate representation for such formations not only in the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. I think that this applies to the other union republics too.

Local soviets on whose territories there is a high multinational population should, of course, set up subunits—their names do not matter—to handle interethnic questions. The soviets' executive organs should do likewise.

We plan to ensure fuller representation in all soviets for citizens of all nationalities living a corresponding territory. It is proposed to expand the network of national cultural societies, which already unite Hungarians, Poles, Jews, and Germans living in the republic.

The most acute problem for us at the moment is that of the Crimean Tartars. We are now working on the socioeconomic aspects of this problem—and they are highly complex. Of course, we will have to solve this problem as we create normal living and working conditions for people.

The question of unofficial movements, which often propel national interests to the fore, should be particularly highlighted. Mostly these constitute a progressive phenomenon that promotes perestroyka. But there is the other side of the coin too. A number of unofficial formations have clearly antisocialist platforms which are often based on bourgeois nationalism. The development of events in a number of regions attests to the clear galvanization of destructive forces. This applies above all in our republic to Lvov, Ternopol, Ivano-Frankovsk, and Kiev. Certain association leaders are even advocating that the republic secede from the USSR, and are proclaiming the priority of one nation over another. The overt aim of these forces is understandable—to win a real victory at the forthcoming elections and take power into their own hands. This was also confirmed by the recent constituent congress of the so-called People's Movement of the Ukraine for Perestroyka.

In this movement's camouflaged program it is clearly possible to discern a line of separatism, national narrowmindedness, and isolationism. It is good that this has been stated quite clearly in PRAVDA articles.

This movement lacks a broad social base in the republic. We are convinced of this, but of course one should not underestimate the danger of extremist and nationalist forces exerting more influence within it. I am, therefore, confident that it is necessary to legislatively implement as swiftly as possible the provision contained in the platform and lay down by law the conditions in which nationalist or chauvinist organizations and groups must be disbanded or banned.

We support, the speaker said, the provision for expanding and strengthening the autonomy of union republic communist parties. At the same time, firmly adhering to Lenin's principle of democratic centralism, we believe that any division of Communists along national lines would pose a grave danger for the entire party. The party was being pushed down this road even while Vladimir Ilich Lenin was alive. And we know how Lenin upheld the internationalist unity of party ranks.

The Ukraine's Bolsheviks also had to overcome separatist tendencies in the creation of the republican party organization in the past. They saw from their own experience where this could lead. Therefore, we find unacceptable the party federalization which is proposed by some people. Essentially, it would lead to an undermining of its political purpose and its consolidating role in society. It is incumbent upon us to launch large-scale work to strengthen the internationalist positions of all party detachments, from republican to primary organizations, down to each and every Communist. Only a united, monolithic,and strong party can be the proper living soul of perestroyka, a ruling political party, the people's vanguard.

The floor was given to N.A. Nazarbayev, first secretary of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee. The draft party platform, he said, and Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report provide a sound foundation for the creation of new mutual relations within our federation and map out the way for a turnabout from conflicts to creative work, which is so necessary for the perestroyka now under way in the country.

I shall make no secret of it, we were really hurt by the words of the people's deputy from Checheno-Ingushetia who spoke at the USSR Supreme Soviet session and demanded an apology from us for the Novyy Uzen events. I offer these apologies on the republic's behalf.

although they are hardly likely to erase the feeling of sorrow from the souls of people who were forced to leave Kazakhstan against their will. Having performed this duty, however, I would like to ask: Who is to offer apologies to the Kazakh people for the fact that their motherland was forcibly transformed into a Gulag subsidiary? Who is to offer apologies for the millions who were forcibly resettled and were forced to seek shelter for themselves and their children in our steppes? The Kazakh people, sacredly honoring the centuries-old traditions of hospitality, did everything to ensure that these hapless victims of Stalin's rule [Stalinshchina], including the Chechen and Ingush, found a second motherland in Kazakhstan. The only point is this: Is it possible, even decades later, to achieve a harmonious and trouble-free coexistence if it was originally founded on cruel arbitrariness and the worst possible human tragedy? Not everything has receded into the past even today. Every people individually and all of us together experience the destructive influence of our single common enemy—the real danger stemming from bureaucratic nationalism. It is under its influence that all our problems, and primarily the social problems, begin to acquire a graphically expressed nationalist hue. Rigid centralization of management and omnipotent diktat by central ministries and departments have transformed our Union into an essentially unitary state.

The speaker then went on to dwell on what he perceived as paramount measures for the renewal of our federation. He specifically said: Military departments alone account for millions of hectares withdrawn from economic circulation in Kazakhstan. For 40 years now, full-scale nuclear weapon tests have been conducted on our territory. The public's demands that they cease are ignored. The population is totally unaware of the consequences of intensive uranium extraction. Of course, all this is necessary to defend the interests of the country as a whole, but it is necessary to explain this necessity to people and to offer compensation for the losses associated with it. But nothing of the sort is being done. The unceremonious fashion in which willful decision are made cannot but offend the people's national feelings. In brief, we need a law on land and land use as much as the air that we breathe.

Exactly the same can be said about legislative acts expanding the republics' economic autonomy up to the right to conclude international [mezhdunarodnyy] economic agreements. So far, we appear rather poverty-stricken in the external arena. Our opportunities to strike international deals are no broader than Ostap Bender's [reference to Ilf and Petrov's fictional smart operator hero of "The Twelve Chairs" and "The Golden Calf"], whose commercial scope was, as we all know, limited to "horns and hooves." True enough, we do have in addition to this "range" a few other categories of nonstandard raw materials and secondary esources, but their are still subject to licenses issued by the center. Is this not a humiliating position for a republic which has unique mineral ore reserves?

Why is it that the CPSU platform, Comrade Nazarbayev went on to say, does not supplement the union republics' right to own and deal with their own land, subterranean wealth, forestry, water, and other resources with the right to utilize all this wealth? Without such a decisive right, a republic's sovereignty would be nothing more than a hollow declaration. As far as Kazakhstan is concerned, being the largest raw material region, this is a question of principle. One is perplexed by the CPSU platform's reproach against local organs that they themselves are apparently to blame for their imbalanced economies. I cannot speak for others, but this rigid policy of the extracting sectors' priority development was always imposed on Kazakhstan by the center.

I say this, the speaker went on, not in order to bandy reproaches but in order to emphasize that, at the present complex stage of the all-Union economy's development, we do not always correctly understand the problems of supply and this, coupled with the far-fetched thesis about individual republics' "dependence," only goes to complicate the political situation. In conditions when our price formation is more reminiscent of a kingdom of distorting mirrors rather than a well organized system, it is—to say the least—naive to debate who is "consuming" whose national income. It is necessary to give republics full economic autonomy with the framework of the federation. This is when the very idea of federation will acquire its true Leninist meaning. We believe that, at this stage, the Union should retain ownership of defense sectors and communications, while ownership of base sector enterprises should be handed over to the republics or they should come under joint management by the republic and a USSR ministry. As regards political autonomy, it must be within limits which are clearly defined and unambiguously laid down by the Constitution. Here it is very important not to go too far, not to bring about the country's decentralization or reach the critical line beyond which lies nothing but anarchy. Any loss of the center's coordinating role in the prevailing and most acute commodity shortages will lead to a break of existing cooperative ties, to reciprocal complaints and conflicts between republics.

This selfsame thoughtfulness and caution must be adopted when approaching the pressing questions of decentralization of internal party relations. It is no secret that, in practical terms, democratic centralism lost its dual dialectical essence a long time ago and sharply tilted in the direction of centralism to the detriment of democracy. Is it normal, for example, to have every single ruble of the party budget literally controlled by the center? Take another sphere of internal party life—the selection and placement of cadres. Here we still feel the effect of rigid diktat and mistrust by the central apparatus. In multicandidate elections, for example, the practice of having candidates for the office of obkom secretaries approved by the CPSU Central Committee is a downright anachronism. But, by force of habit, we close our eyes to this. The time has come to entrust such matters to union republic communist party central committees, whose rights must be significantly expanded.

When analyzing the causes of the well-known Alma-Ata events in December 1986, we still bashfully pass over in silence one very important aspect which, in our view, was largely responsible for provoking extremist actions. What I have in mind is the Communist Party Central Committee plenum which was held, in the worst traditions of the period of stagnation, just before the events: It was devoted to a question of utmost importance for the republic's party organization—the election of the Central Committee's first secretary—and it lasted all of 18 minutes. I must say that nobody had anything against the candidacy of Georgiy Vasilyevich Kolbin, but what roused indignation was the total disregard for the opinion of even the party aktiv. It was natural that a decision made by raising hands without any consultation with people produced a negative response in the republic. Nationalistically inclined elements wasted no time in taking advantage of this.

Actually, this was not the first time that we encountered such voluntarism in Kazakhstan. Back in 1979, mass disturbances in Tselinograd were also caused by an insufficiently considered and surreptitiously made decision to create a German autonomous formation on the oblast's territory, a decision which later had to be quickly repealed.

The well known resolution on Kazakhstan ought to be listed in that same series of hasty and thoughtless decisions. It contained not only groundless but also insulting formulations. For example, it contains the idea of "Kazakh nationalism." But is it possible in principle for any people as a whole to acquire this inhuman trait? I am profoundly convinced that it is not. There can be no such thing as Kazakh, Russian, Uzbek, Lettish, and so on nationalism, in the same way as there can be no such thing as national democracy [natsionalnaya demokratiya].

Expressing the opinion of the republic's Communists and public, N.A. Nazarbayev said, I ask the Central Committee to review these erroneous provisions of the resolution which offend the Kazakh people's honor and dignity and cast aspersions on their internationalist nature.

There is an endless list of examples of totally unjustified diktat. At the same time, one cannot fail to notice that it is amazingly coupled with indecisiveness and passiveness. Communists are justified in asking: Why is it that for a whole year the CPSU Central Committee, the Supreme Soviet, and the country's government failed to produce a principled evaluation of events posing a real danger to the unity of Soviet republics and the cause of internationalism? Why did they suffer in silence the attacks on the CPSU?

Speaking of our federation's problems, the speaker said that the CPSU is an indivisible political organism whose integrity guarantees the strength of our multinational socialist state.

It is no secret that today some of the zealous champions of so-called "ethnic sterility" and preachers of the rotten idea of "national priority" are doing their utmost to implant in people's minds a durable image of an internal enemy who could easily be blamed for all the calamities that have befallen a given nation. We cannot but be alarmed by the increasingly persistent attempts to identify this image with the Russian people, and to attribute to them all the sins of the Stalin rule [Stalinshchina]. The reason behind such attempts is obvious. It boils down to undermining the consolidating importance of the Russian nation, weakening the centuries-old bonds of friendship and brotherhood linking the Russian people with the country's numerous peoples and ethnic groups, and achieving our Union's breakdown. Is this not the pipedream of those who would like to weaken our great motherland? Can we accept this and allow it to happen?

The Kazakh people asked Russia to help them and threw in their lot with it in the 18th century, when we were threatened by total annihilation. And even though the centuries of oppression resulting from the colonial policy of czarism cannot be erased from history, in the same way that no part of a song's lyrics can be erased, our people have not forgotten Russia's support at the time of the "great calamity," when it was a question of whether or not the Kazakh nation should continue to exist.

Friendship with Russia is not just a matter of our historical past. Today it still not only guarantees our economic development, but also protects us from any possible (who knows) encroachments against our land in the future. It would not go amiss if everyone were to ponder this.

Democracy and glasnost, for which we all are so eagerly striving, must not become an excuse for settling accounts between peoples; do not break the centuries-old bonds but strengthen them—this is the call of perestroyka. And yet we have come to the point where we feel embarrassed to speak words like "friendship," "brotherhood," "motherland," or "patriotism."

The speaker then went on to focus attention on the problem of national languages, emphasizing in particular: We participants in perestroyka cannot fail to understand the peoples' passionate desire to save their language at the borderline beyond which lies nothing but nonexistence. As Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said in his report, people perceive such real protection in a radical measure—legislatively enshrining the state status of national languages. But when proclaiming as state language the language of the people after whom a republic is named, it is also necessary to provide equal legislative guarantees for the free development of the languages of all other peoples inhabiting its territory.

Bearing in mind that the USSR Constitution will be reviewed, the new edition must without fail proclaim that the Russian language is the language of interethnic contacts between the peoples of the Soviet state.

Addressing M.S. Gorbachev in conclusion, N.A. Nazarbayev said: No matter what complications we might face today, no matter what difficulties lie in wait for us along the path to the set goal, the overwhelming majority of people clearly realize that we have no alternative to perestroyka. We will either lead it to a victorious conclusion, as the saying goes, or we will end up back in the blind alley of stagnation. Therefore, the Kazakh Communists' mandate to the CPSU Central Committee and the Politburo is: Pursue the charted coures more resolutely.

Yu.S. Karabasov, secretary of the Moscow city party committee [gorkom], took the floor. We can all sense, he said, the social tension in society and the contradictions in many spheres of life have become unprecedentedly acute.

The clash of opinions on the question of our motherland's fate clearly goes beyond the confines of socialist pluralism and from the realm of ideas into the realm of real politics. In this connection there is great anxiety at the growth of nationalist sentiments, confederative tendencies, and tendencies toward national exclusiveness and territorial isolation. Attempts are also being made to split the party into national compartments. That is why, in Moscow Communists' opinion, the well balanced CPSU platform and the series of sobering propoitsions in today's report are a good foundation for the stabilization and development of interethnic relations in our country. It is important, of course, to implement these proposals consistently.

Unfortunately, the implementation of plans is at the moment the weakest point in our work.

That is confirmed by a study of public opinion, especially among our city's working people and residents. They note the indecisiveness and inconsistency of the political leadership of perestroyka and the lack of appropriate reaction to the erosion of socialist values and ideals. The point is that the Communist Party must be the active integrating force and guarantor ensuring the unity of our Union.

At the same time the state of affairs in the party, the speaker went on, is causing serious concern and alarm among Moscow's Communists and the city's party organizations. Ideological vacillation, organizational instability, and the increasing exodus from party ranks create uncertainty and confusion among many Communists including the party aktiv. The speaker described the recent party gorkom plenum.

Now, in the conditions of the discussion which has been started, he said, we are seeking to ensure that party meetings and primary party organizations are the focal point of that discussion and that all the city's Communists participate in it. There is a broad social dialogue under way in which no one has a monopoly of the truth and no topics are excluded from discussion.

The result of the discussion will be our concrete proposals relating to the party Rules and proposals on the CPSU political platform which Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev discussed in today's report. We are summarizing all this— with regard to the coming 28th party congress—at a party gorkom plenum at the end of this year.

Today we have adopted a decision on the timing of the next party congress. One proposal—to hold the congress in October next year—will of course create a difficult situation for primary party organizations which will have to complete the next reports and elections in spring, just 6 months after the current report and election campaign.

For that reason, perhaps, we should agree to make do with reports and elections at republic, kray, oblast, city, and rayon level in spring and summer 1990. As for primary party organizations, their next reports and elections could be held immediately after the congress on the basis of its decisions.

In the plan for the preparation for the routine party congress the discussion of the CPSU's nationalities policy at today's plenum is undoubtedly of crucial significance. For the multinational city party organization, the principled approaches to the development of our federation which are being elaborated today will be practical guidelines in its internationalist activity.

Moscow is experiencing for itself the results of the distortions in nationalities policy and is suffering from the diktat of the central ministries and departments. The domination of the sectorial approach has disrupted normal ties between the city, republics, and individual regions of the country.

We see the solution to this situation first and foremost in the adoption of a law on Moscow's status as the capital of the USSR and the Russian Federation. It could regulate Moscow's relationship, as the largest national-economic and cultural complex, with the republics and regions on a sound legal and economic basis.

The capital's status must also be consolidated by transferring Moscow to economic accountability. A draft statute on the city's transfer to work and life in conditions of economic accountability relations has now been prepared.

We, of course, think that in the elaboration of this concept it is fundamentally important for us not to fence ourselves off from the interests of the republics and other regions, as has been said today, but to comprehensively strengthen traditional and existing economic ties so as of course to prevent economic separatism which is in principle ruinous to the city as to any other territory.

Since earliest times Moscow has developed as the distinctive multinational center of our great country. For centuries the great variety of national cultures, crafts, and architectural styles has been represented here. Back

in the twenties and early thirties, Lenin's ideas on the unconditional satisfaction of each Soviet person's national needs were actively implemented in Moscow. The city had ethnic workers clubs, ethnic schools, ethnic unions and societies, and ethnic newspapers. We are returning to the Leninist practice of developing interethnic relations. There are nine city ethnic cultural societies working in Moscow now. In the very near future several more social formations will be given that status.

Furthermore, a whole series of cultural-national organizations are working at rayon level. Over 40 interschool departments have opened in Moscow to teach the languages of the peoples of the USSR. A national cinematographers' center has begun work. Union republic cultural and trade centers are being created, albeit slowly.

Of course, these are only the first steps.

Particular problems include Moscow's rebirth as the RSFSR's spiritual center, not just its administrative center. We support the proposal that Moscow should have permanent centers representing the autonomous republics, oblasts, and okrugs of the RSFSR. During the discussion of the draft platform Muscovites actively supported the creation of a Soviet of Nationalities in the RSFSR Supreme Soviet.

As is well known, a decision has been taken on the creation of RSFSR trade unions. The proposals on the creation of other Russian republic social formations also deserve every attention. Against this background the idea of a republic party organization requires more comprehensive elaboration.

There is no doubt, the speaker noted in conclusion, that the party program and rules must be integrated, like the CPSU Program and Statutes. At the same time, the existence of a Russian republic organization in conditions of perestroyka may make it possible to give more objective help to the renewal of party work at local level. Thus the center would be closer to the wide range of practical problems being tackled in the RSFSR's regions. Internationalist positions in the party would also be strengthened.

The floor passed to Yu.N. Prokopyev, first secretary of the Yakutsk party obkom. Many questions are answered, he said, in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report at today's party Central Committee plenum and in the party's draft platform which is under discussion. They analyze the objective and subjective reasons for the contradictions and difficulties which have accumulated in the solution of the nationalities question. A strategy of further work to consolidate society and harmonize interethnic relations with the positions of perestroyka has been prepared.

The CPSU platform has taken a major step forward in the consideration of the problems and elaboration of a realistic nationalities policy in present day conditions. At the same time the draft platform has not addressed all the urgent questions or examined them to an equal extent or the same depth. Even though it talks cogently about the rights and obligations of the union republics and quite clearly about expanding the rights of the ethnic groups of the North, Siberia, and the Far East and of other small peoples, we cannot say the same for the autonomous formations.

In my view, the speaker noted, the draft does not examine the present-day problems of federalism and national autonomous units in sufficient depth, there are no scientifically validated criteria for defining union and autonomous republics, and no consideration of the dialectics of their development at the present stage and for the future.

At the dawn of Soviet power, Vladimir Ilich Lenin, taking into account the fact that some peoples and ethnic groups had chosen the path of socialist development while bypassing the capitalist formation and possessing different levels of economic and political consolidation, correctly defined the status of autonomous units as the one designed for the solution of local and national questions, in other words, this means partial [nepolnyy] self-determination and partial state sovereignty.

The situation has now changed radically. Many present-day autonomous republics have outgrown the **concept of autonomy in the form in which they were created** and are resolving not only local and national questions but also all-union tasks on equal terms with the union republics and are playing a significant role in the all-union division of labor.

It seems that there are no fundamental obstacles to raising the question of the transformation of the autonomous republics into union republics. At this stage, however, taking into account the political situation and the economic state of the country, it is our view that it is more expedient to raise the question of expanding the rights of the autonomous units in such a way that they possess the real right to control their own territory, in other words, the rights of the autonomous republics must be approximated as closely as possible to the rights of the union republics.

The ownership and use of land, its minerals, and natural resources undoubtedly constitute a very important question here, Yu.N. Prokopyev stressed. This is particularly necessary for republics where this forms the basic source of wealth both today and long term. Such is precisely the case with the Yakutsk ASSR.

He supported the provision that a union republic should have the right to own and use the land and its mineral resources. But to really extend the rights of autonomous republics, particularly in respect of raw materials, it is necessary to go further, in his opinion, and grant the right to union republics—this particularly affects the RSFSR—to delegate to certain autonomous republics the right to own and use land and its minerals on fixed terms and for a fixed period. In this event union and union republic ministries and departments should structure their relations with autonomous republics regarding

the use of land, minerals, and natural resources on a contractual, lease basis with appropriate payments into the autonomous republic budget. The autonomous republic supreme organs of power should enjoy the right not only to protest acts passed by the organs of administration of the USSR and union republic, as is stated in the draft platform, but should have the right to suspend the operation of [acts of] union and union republic ministries and departments and have the right the right to protest (without suspension) acts of the USSR Council of Ministers and union republic if they run counter to the Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic's [ASSR's] constitution, the interests of nature protection, and other substantive interests of the autonomous republic. At the present time the Yakutsk ASSR is elaborating the concept for, and economic calculations supportive of, the transition to self-management and self-financing. With the existing system of prices and distribution and redistribution of national income generated, the Yakutsk ASSR does not possess sufficient financial resources of its own, it receives subsidies and is not credit-worthy....

Yakutia occupies one of the hindmost places in the country in terms of basic indicators of living standards for both the urban and rural population. These indicators are particularly low in rural localities, where the Yakuts and ethnic groups of the north predominantly live. Hence the question additionally assumes a political hue.

Such a situation is due to the one-sided structure of the republic's economy, the exaggerated development of mining sectors, particularly diamond- and gold-mining, and the fact that a considerable part of the national income generated ends up outside the republic in sectors which process and utilize diamonds, gold, and fur, or goes straight into the union budget, including in the shape of hard currency.

We consider, the speaker went on to say, that it is extremely necessary, among other things, to carry out the following measures, for example. In particular, to hand over part of the turnover tax raised outside the Yakutsk ASSR not only from the sale of fur and hide goods but also jewelry manufactured from Yakut diamonds and gold. And also to hand over to the republic part of the profit generated from the sale and use of products manufactured from raw materials obtained from the republic and not subject to turnover tax and allow the republic to sell output produced in excess of the state order at contract prices on the domestic and foreign markets, partcularly petroleum and and coal. He proposed expanding the republic's right in respect of setting up joint ventures, drawing up trade deals, carrying out registration and licensing, and creating a currency fund through normative deductions from the amount of the Yakutsk ASSR's contribution to the all-union currency fund. Here, of course, the economic effect should be assessed in terms of world prices.

The CPSU platform, Yu.N. Prokopyev went on, pays special attention to the position of the ethnic groups of the north. And this instils a sense of certainty in the future in the heart of the inhabitants of the north and inspires trust in and respect for the party document. The Communists and working people of Yakutia feel a sense of satisfaction that their basic proposals to resolve the problems of the inhabitants of the north have been taken account of and are reflected in the CPSU platform. This involves the creation of a mechanism for electing representatives of small peoples to the supreme organs of the country and republics and the formation of an association which will represent their interests at all levels of the organization of national rayons. In particular, the first such rayon—the Eveno-Britantayskiy Rayon—has already been created in the republic. There are the proposals to form an RSFSR state committee on questions of the social, economic, and cultural development of the ethnic groups of the North and also the guarantee of real equality of languages.

The provision that "it is essential to grant the Soviets of those territories the exclusive right to develop them economically" is particularly supported.

The question of recognizing both Yakut and Russian as state languages is being insistently raised in Yakutia today, the speaker observed. In so doing we fully support the thesis expounded in Mikhail Sergeyevich's report that Russian be accorded statewide language status. In taking such steps it is clearly necessary to adopt measures which will promote in every way the development of other languages and eliminate conditions which morally encroach upon the rights of people who do not know or have a poor knowledge of a particular state language. It is necessary to adopt a law on the languages of the peoples of the USSR which legislatively defines the freedom of development and equality of all languages and the voluntary nature of their study.

There was a time when a manifestation of national self-awareness was often taken for nationalism. The objective growth of national self-awareness is a progressive process. However, there does exist a danger that this growth could be accompanied by manifestations of national arrogance and conceit and a painful exacerbation of national feeling. This manifests itself, as a rule, at the level of commonplace [obydennyy] awareness, particularly among young people, which did occurr just over 3 years ago in the city of Yakutsk, to which the party central committee secretariat promptly responded with the Resolution "On Certain Negative Manifestations Among Young People in the City of Yakutsk."

The resolution was aimed at further improving the internationalist education of the republic's working people. The oblast party organization has always faced, faces now, and will continue to face this task. The party obkom has drawn up an action program and system of measures which are being implemented and have brought certain positive changes. However, Yu.N. Prokopyev said in conclusion, the Communists of the republic and its multinational population have repeatedly raised and continue to raise the question of the

fairness of the assessments of the events that occurred in which a small group of young people, mostly adolescents, took part. No working people, Communists, members of the intelligentsia, or veterans took part in the events. The events do no reflect the moral-political situation in the republic as a whole, the indigenous population of which has historically been bound by bonds of friendship with the Russian people for more than 350 years. Unfortunately, a not very accurate assessment of this, particularly in the light of subsequent events in a number of regions of the country, was given in the reports at the party central committee February (1988) plenum and the 20th All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League [Komsomol] Congress, in which what happened was presented as a Yakutia-wide event. After this, the assessment—which caused a sense of protest among the majority of the inhabitants of Yakutia, who knew the facts of the matter—began appearing in central newspapers in articles dealing with the topic of interethnic relations.

The speaker then cited examples illustrating, in his view, the mistaken interpretation of the events in Yakutia that appeared on the pages of certain central publications. He asked the party Central Committee to reassess what happened in the city of Yakutsk in 1986. That will serve to harmonize interethnic relations.

The report to this Central Committee Plenum and the Central Committee Statement on the Position in the Soviet Baltic Republics, the speaker said, show us convincingIty once again that we Communists bear exceptional responsibility for the unity of the CPSU, the future of our multinational homeland, and the future of Soviet people. And all our thoughts and deeds should meet those imperatives.

This CPSU Central Committee Plenum has been awaited everywhere with particular impatience, R.N. Nishanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities, said. Extremely high hopes are pinned on it. And that is understandable, for the situation is very alarming. The nationalities question has become so acute today that perestroyka's future depends upon its correct and timely solution. This is correctly stated both in the report by Comrade Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and in the draft CPSU Platform "The Party's Nationalities Policy in Present-Day Conditions." For the first time in decades the problems accumulated are being comprehensively examined in detail on a party-wide scale, the state [sostoyaniye] of the issue is being critically and objectively assessed, and it is being tackled in a new way. It is not a matter of improving or modifying the party's nationalities policy but of radically renewing it.

Of course, like every draft, the platform requires further finishing touches and the amplification of individual positions and formulations. But, in my view, the main point is that we have an important political document that provides an objective assessment of the state of national relations in the country and contains new ideas and thoughts on the means of improving our federation. I would like to voice some of my thoughts.

First. Perestroyka has created utterly new conditions for manifestations of increasing national awareness, the speaker said. This has become possible owing to the CPSU's new political course. All this can only be welcomed. But we must not close our eyes to the fact that, along with the increase in self-awareness, we have also encountered trends and phenomena that pose a danger to the future of the peoples and threaten to break up society, shake the foundations of the state, and do irreparable damage to perestroyka.

Interethnic conflicts, which often manifest themselves in the ugliest forms, are assuming catastrophic dimensions. We are receiving reports from various areas of fresh acts of vandalism, the blockade of vital arteries, violence, arson, killings, and other atrocities. Tens of thousands of Soviet people have become refugees in peacetime. Making themselves felt in all of this are, on the one hand, some peoples' national egoism and intolerance toward the representatives of other peoples, along with the poor level of overall culture, the decline in moral standards, and the lack of daily, purposeful, educative work; and on the other hand—the incompleteness and even the absence of a law establishing maximum responsibility for the perpetration of ethnically-motivated crimes and the incitement of interethnic dissension.

R.N. Nishanov proposed speeding up the elaboration of proposals regarding changes to a number of the articles of the criminal law that make provision for inevitable punishment for ethnic crimes, and he proposed that law-enforcement organs radically improve and toughen the practice of applying existing laws to criminals.

The report, he said, very rightly raises the question of legislative guarantees for all the rights of peoples who live outside their national-territorial formations or who lack such formations. This is a pressing problem today and affects the interests of more than 60 million of our country's inhabitants. Supreme Soviet committees and commissions are currently working on such a draft law and also on a draft law on citizenship. Our laws must assert the equality of all peoples and above all defend human rights.

It would, obviously, be correct if the Central Committee plenum were to demand that party organs and all leadership cadres increase their responsibility for interethnic incidents. For instance, I am not shirking moral responsibility for the events in Fergana. This was a serious lesson.

Second. The 12th Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) Congress resolution stressed that "finding the key to the correct solution of the nationalities question does not mean a full and definitive solution or resolving it in concrete and practical terms." The essence of the question now lies precisely in the "concrete and practical

implementation" of the ideas and directives expounded in the CPSU draft platform and of those demands now being made by life itself.

The USSR Supreme Soviet and its Soviet of Nationalities, in particular, see their task as being to transform political directives into the language of legislative acts and strengthen and develop the legal foundations for the settlement of national relations. We must undertake in earnest the full implementation of Lenin's idea of the USSR as a federation of equal and sovereign nations and ethnic groups. It is firstly a matter of creating a juridical mechanism to protect the sovereign rights of the republics and any national formations within our great motherland. Naturally, the USSR is not a rigid model of a state system, and questions of its improvement must be resolved. But at the same time I want to say bluntly that we cannot set about breaking up our existing state system and, say, transforming our federation into a confederation, or engage in redrawing our borders, as some comrades are suggesting. That would mean undermining the foundations of our union, our historical interconnections, and our unity.

We must all realize with supreme responsibility that we cannot set about destroying what we have created and renounce what we have already gained from our federation and which may be considerably renewed and multiplied within it. Any other approach involves the path of destruction and ruin. We support the clear-cut positions laid out in Mikhail Sergeyevich's report on this question.

The most important thing today is to improve our federation. Many proposals are being voiced today about autonomous formations, their status, and so on. The USSR Supreme Soviet has received proposals to transform certain autonomous republics into union republics. It is also being proposed that the division between union and autonomous republics be abandoned. The question of substantially broadening the rights of autonomous republics, oblasts, national okrugs, and so on has been raised.

It goes without saying that these proposals merit attention, but they need to be analyzed and subjected to very serious study; there is no point in rushing this, the speaker continued.

He supported the proposals to create an association comprising the ethnic groups of the North, Siberia, and the Far East, and also to set up a state body within the Russian Federation's Council of Ministers and the USSR Council of Ministers which would tackle the development of national republics, oblasts, okrugs, and rayons, and examine interethnic relations as a whole. Improving our federation, the speaker said, will necessitate changes in the USSR Constitution and the constitutions of the union and autonomous republics and the adoption of new laws and innovative decisions. This work has begun and I would, of course, like it to be implemented more vigorously.

Third: I believe that everyone is satisfied by the fact that a whole section of the CPSU draft platform is devoted to the problems of the Russian Federation.

There is no need to say what Russia means to the Union and what role it plays in the history of our state and the destiny of its peoples. The Russian people have merited our gratitude and thanks for everything they have done. It is immoral to repay good with evil and to see a Russian merely as an "immigrant," an "occupier," or a "foreigner." Why are these anti-Russian sentiments arising in some areas? We received a letter from E.Ye. Frantseva in Leningrad. She writes: "I cannot be suspected of Great Russian chauvinism. I am not wholly Russian. My ancestors were Austrians. I am not a party member and I am a profound believer. I am angered by what I see around me. It has become fashionable to vent vitriolic spleen on Russians. Russia has always been the 'backbone' of the Soviet Union. While it was strong, so was the Union..." This is a cry from the heart, Comrades.

We must respect and value one another, whatever nationality we are, and protect all peoples from undeserved insults.

Fourth. We rightly say that the main "knots" of interethnic relations that we have to unravel today "are tied up" in the past. One such "tight knot" is the fate of the peoples who suffered unwarranted repressions. Decades have elapsed, but justice has still not been done with regard to thse people. Attempts to resolve the questions relating to autonomy for the Crimean Tatars in Uzbekistan and the Soviet Germans in Kazakhstan have not been successful. Comrade Nazarbayev spoke about this here. Why have they not been successful. Because the republic's leaders were willing but the peoples were not. That is why they were not successful. But the years are going by and the solution of these problems is becoming increasingly complex.

As is well known, the USSR Supreme Soviet has set up commissions to deal with the problems of the Soviet Germans, the Meskhetian Turks, and the Crimean Tatars. The commissions are operating under complex conditions, and in the near future they are to submit their proposals to the Soviet of Nationalities. The speaker went on to dwell on questions that are retarding the solution of these problems.

From the example of the numerous commissions on the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] we have seen that no commission can achieve anything in the absence of the good will of the parties involved . As for the Soviet Germans, Crimean Tatars, and Meskhetian Turks, they are persistently and doggedly seeking the right to live in those areas from which they were evicted in an inhuman fashion. Is this endeavor justified? Yes, undoubtedly. Are there any difficulties in implementing it? Yes, of course there are, because one cannot help but take into account the realities that have taken place in the Crimea, the Volga region, and Meskhetia over the last 50 years or so. But close familiarization with the

specific situation in the localities shows that the solution of the problem is being complicated by both objective factors and certain prejudices and even a reluctance on the part of individual leading cadres "to trouble themselves" with this difficult question, along with the absence of extensive explanatory work among the broad masses of the population.

An official legislative act must be adopted regarding full political rehabilitation for all peoples who suffered unwarranted repressions. It would be good if M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, submitted a proposal to the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies on this question.

We need a clear political line in this respect. I feel we also need a targeted state program for the gradually return—as the conditions for this are created—of those who wish to return to their native lands, without encroaching on the interests of the people currently living in those areas. The possibilities for this exist everywhere. This must be said frankly and clearly at the plenum today. Union-level bodies, the bodies of those republics which people leave, and the bodies of those republics to which people move could all play a part in the creation and implementation of this state program.

The language problem, Comrade Nishanov continued, now has strong political overtones. The majority of republics have declared their national language as the state language and the others are preparing to do so. I would like to say from this rostrum that, in some places, other languages, particularly Russian, are discriminated against to some extent by the adoption of these laws. We cannot allow this. Russian is the language of interethnic communication. Our commissions are currently working on the draft of an all-union law on languages, and I think that Russian, as the language of interethnic communication and as the all-state language, will find a worthy place in this draft law, which will be submitted for nationwide discussion.

Supporting the proposal to convene the next CPSU Congress in October next year, the speaker stressed that the CPSU is the main force in the consolidation of nations and in the implementation and improvement of national policy. Only it can ensure the stability, integrity, and continuity of our development.

The debate on M.S. Gorbachev's report was continued on 19 September at the evening sitting of the CPSU Central Committee plenum. I do realise, V.G. Afanasyev, chief editor of PRAVDA, said, that we have a specific theme—that of ethnic relations—but it seems to me that this subject can and must be discussed and resolved only in conjunction with other issues: economic, sociopolitical, and spiritual.

I feel that some of the speeches (I do not say all) have touched rather narrowly on this subject and have been very similar to one another. For that reason, I am going to allow myself to return to the party congress which we are expecting to hold in October next year.

I think that a good date has been chosen for the congress, if only because it will perhaps be the first congress in many decades to precede a 5-year plan period. The reverse has been true in the past: First the 5-year plan period would begin and then the congress would approve it. It does, of course, not leave us a great deal of time, and we have an enormous amount of work to do. Especially as two more campaigns will precede the congress—elections to party bodies and elections to the Supreme Soviets of the national republics and to local soviets. It seems to me that there is some concern, a certain amount of confusion, and a certain degree of fear on the eve of these elections. Comrades are afraid lest we lose more than in the elections to the USSR Supreme Soviet. We have to overcome this uncertainty and this fear, and in this we—the party and the press—must work together.

What must we do to ensure that the elections are successful? It seems to me that, first and foremost, we must do our utmost to resolve as many of the specific problems concerning people at local level as possible. This is our sorest spot, and we often fail to solve these problems. Our electorate is forced to appeal to the center, to the Supreme Soviet, to the party's Central Committee, to the Council of Ministers, and to central organs of the press. This is one aspect of the matter.

The second point is this. We must prepare ourselves fully for the elections. We are still only beginning to stir ourselves, as far as I can judge from the PRAVDA mailbag. This is a difficult job, a complicated job. But the most important thing here, it seems to me, is to work with the masses, work among the masses, without excluding informal associations. Experience has shown that it is possible to talk to informal associations, argue with them, and even defeat them. If we can win these ideological battles and discussions, we can count on success. Of course, I do not think that, in terms of percentages, there are going to be few or fewer Communists in the republics' soviets and in the local soviets. I do not think that at all. But, after all, you and I are perfectly well aware, the speaker said, that no two Communists are alike.

There is the majority, the strong majority of Communists, who still firmly adhere to the positions of the party and the positions of restructuring. They are working for restructuring. We must seek out the very best of them and show them off. We at PRAVDA have published 70 biographical sketches on first secretaries. The first edition of this book has already come out. We are now preparing the second. But there are also conservatives and—I do not shy away from this word—saboteurs, who work on the principle: the worse things are, the better. What other explanation is there for the difficult situation in the market and in a number of other areas that we are now encountering?

There are extremists, ultrasupporters of restructuring, super-radicals, and populists. You are familiar with them: They flash across the television screens from morning till night, talk on the radio, and fill newspapers, journals, and books. What is more, some of them carry party membership cards. To me, for example, this is totally incomprehensible. How can this be? They take an antiparty, anti-Soviet stance and carry party membership cards in their pockets. I do not have to look far for examples—take the speech by the person who has the same name as me. Incidentally, this is sometimes a problem, because people confuse us, and I do not wish to be confused with him. Quite recently he said that the party has been leading us in the wrong direction for 70 years and that PRAVDA should be closed down because it misinforms society. You cannot go much further than that.

I must say that we sometimes make concessions to our opponents, to our ideological enemies. One concession leads to another, and sometimes these concessions are ones of principle. We, for example, do not have a clear idea—I think that these questions must be answered by the congress very clearly and definitely—who we are, what kind of system we have, and where we live. What do we live by? What are our ideals? Where are we going? The congress must give a 5-year program, a realistic program, a militant program, an optimistic program, if you like, so that our people, Communists, and working people have clear, realistic prospects.

We must also, the speaker continued, take account of the mood and opinions of our friends—communists abroad. Because they judge our actions not only on the basis of our official statements but also from various organs of the press which are circulated throughout the world.

A few words about journalist matters. It is fashionable, very fashionable to abuse the press. The press is blamed for what has been done and what has not been done. Well, dear comrades, the press is not something amorphous, something totally uniform. There is PRAVDA, there is MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI, there is SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, there is OGONEK. I could give you a whole number of other parallels. Let us be more specific in our criticism, otherwise it is simply offensive to us. Offensive, because we are all being tarred with the same brush: Those who loyally serve party policy and restructuring and those who try to undermine restructuring by masquerading as superadvocates of restructuring in one way or another. I would very much like to see the press supported by the party and the Central Committee both at the center and at local level.

In the opinion of the speaker, the articles "Trial of Conscience, or Something About Life in Armenia," "Lessons of Glasnost," and others published in PRAVDA were not given proper support at the time.

I feel that it was rather different, a little better before. A whole host of items in PRAVDA and other newspapers were reflected in resolutions passed by the CPSU Central Committee. This practice has now been dropped for some reason. Despite the fact that there are principled items in PRAVDA, for example, and in other newspapers and will continue to be.

A couple of words about paper. First there is paper and then there is not. The first reason why there is no paper is that there is no timber, the timber is not being transported. Although there are hundreds of millions of cubic meters of timber waiting to be transported. But even if it were and the paper were made, there are no railroad cars to deliver the paper. There are no railroad cars because thousands, tens of thousands of them are waiting to be unloaded. It is a vicious circle. At the PRAVDA publishing house, V.G. Afanasyev stressed, we have enough paper for the next 2 or 3 days at a time, but in some areas newspapers cannot be printed because there is no paper. On the other hand, hundreds, if not thousands of different "illegal" publications are being brought out. And on good quality paper too. And they use phototypesetting, which is something we can still only dream about. So, there is paper and there is the equipment. Where does it all go?

The speaker then raised the question of strengthening the newspaper's material and technical base. PRAVDA, he said, is the organ of the CPSU Central Committee but we are living in the middle ages—we still use the hot lead composing method. We cannot come up with R1-1.5 million for the central organ of the party press to buy a modern system of electronic- or photo-typesetting equipment.

In conclusion, the speaker touched on the question of so-called protocol. We have a lot of letters from readers, he said, criticizing us for printing so much official material: resolutions, decisions, speeches, communiques, meetings, departures, and arrivals. We are obliged to print this information. PRAVDA, for example, is obliged to print party information and reports—we cannot get away from this and have no complaints on this score. But information and reports can, after all, be divided up.

For government and soviet information and reports there is IZVESTIYA, and for other kinds there are other newspapers. But the fact is that we are often held up because of this protocol information. And, once we lose time, the newspaper is late in getting to the reader.

V.I. Vorotnikov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, takes the floor. Expressing his stance on the draft CPSU platform, he noted: In my opinion this is a multilayered, profound document. It creatively develops the Leninist concept, taking account, of course, of the actual situation currently prevailing.

Well-balanced and well-conceived solutions are proposed. Unquestionably this document can serve as a good basis for the party's work in the sphere of ethnic relations. I am convinced that the platform, in which the nationalities policy is viewed as an organic part of the

perestroyka process, will stimulate the work of soviet and economic organs and social organizations in all its sectors.

Today, when perestroyka is passing through a stage of probably its most difficult trials, when attacks on it are massing both from the right and the left, we are faced with the task of defending it as the only correct path of the Soviet society's development. Difficulties and crisis situations are arising not because the party has made a mistake in its strategic calculations. The decisive reason for perestroyka failing to make headway is, in my opinion, the fact that, despite the broad politicization of the masses, the creative activeness and the socialist consciousness of the people—and, it is possible to claim, even the Communists—have not yet reached the level necessary for genuinely revolutionary changes.

We are aware that the economic reform and the new forms of management have failed to yield the expected results. There is evidence of emphasis on local interests, narrow sectorial approaches, and manifestations of group egoism among the working people, not to mention the aspiration for national exclusivity and separatism. One section of the population has fallen under the influence of extremist political slogans, another section is in a conservative mood, unable to perceive real changes in the social conditions of life.

Why is all this happening? I believe that is it largely due to the fact that, having chosen the correct path of democratization and glasnost, we have to some extent obviously idealized these processes. We have failed to attach due significance to the circumstance that in addition to the healthy forces which predominate in society, forces which are essentially opposed to perestroyka have availed themselves of democracy for their own purposes.

This applies to economic, ethnic, and political problems. Glasnost, too, has been used as a weapon not only by those who uphold the unity of the state but also by those who seek to split it, using perestroyka slogans as a cover. The politicization of the masses is by no means tantamount to strengthened support for the party; antisocial, antisocialist, and nationalist forces are also expanding their influence.

Vladimir Ilich Lenin once said that in order to introduce a cooperative system an entire cultural revolution is needed, and he elaborated the concept of such a revolution. Unquestionably, the transformations to which perestroyka is geared demand a no less thorough preparation of the working people, no less radical changes in social consciousness, and a new quality of political thinking.

Naturally, we should have borne this in mind. If we do not want to delude ourselves, we must admit that we did not carry out this work in time and on the necessary scale.

In actual fact we have entered into battle—and only then have we started thinking about the paths to the new heights of progress. It has to be admitted that to some extent this was dictated by the prevailing circumstances. However, there can be no justification for the fact that subsequently, ignoring plain political logic, people in some places began to shake the ideological foundations on which our entire multifaceted society rests.

Another series of our weaknesses lies, in my opinion, in the serious failure to see things through in concrete organizational work in key sectors of perestroyka. Here we ourselves have to accpept part of the blame. I am referring to the Central Committee, the government, and the Politburo. I believe that we frequently lag in analyzing the situation, assessing events, and even in preparing appropriate decisions. Or, on the contrary, we are in too much of a hurry, we act impulsively, without thinking our actions through several moves ahead, so to speak.

No one, of course, including the party leadership is immune against making mistakes; mistakes have always been made, and they will continue to be made. There is no need to go into the miscalculations committed in the economic sphere, for one, in the formation of the new economic mechanism—everyone is familiar with them. Today we have to add to the list of our failures also the negative trends which have emerged in the scientific and technical process, which is very alarming in my view, and the obvious disruptions in the fulfillment of the national economic plan for the current year.

Comrades, when it becomes obvious that specific decisions or actions are not working, it is necessary, naturally, to rectify this without delay; but we frequently seem to be waiting for something. This probably is a manifestation of the common ailment—too much talk, and less effort on the part of each and everyone in doing their job. Both in party organizations and in soviet organs there is still too much rhetoric instead of vigorous, practical work.

We, the speaker said, clearly do not have the resources for a simultaneous offensive in all spheres. Maybe we should stop and think once again with a view to focusing efforts on the priority, decisive, shock elements of perestroyka. What I have said applies in particular to the transfer of part of the functions from party organs to the soviets. This process has dragged on unjustifiably. Many party committees have given up attending to economic matters which are not their concern; while the Soviets have not yet tackled this work in earnest, they lack the appropriate apparatus, and even their rights in these questions have not yet been accurately defined, as you know. In short, another impermissible crack has appeared in perestroyka which must be plugged without delay. Meanwhile forces which are seeking to erect parallel political structures in society are speculating on the shortcomings in the leadership of the perestroyka process. This is a fact.

It seems to me that the parameters of perestroyka which relate to ethnic issues have to be viewed precisely

through the prism of all these problems. We have frankly admitted how acute and complex is the situation in a number of the country's regions. Without sinning against the truth, it cannot be claimed that no attention was paid in the past to the development of national economies and cultures, the training of national cadres, and other aspects of the nationalities policy. However, it would be equally wrong to deny that for a long time we underestimated the whole depth of the ethnic processes, comforting ourselves with illusions.

Nonetheless, I will be so bold as to say that the conflict situations which have occurred and are still occurring in a number of union republics, including the RSFSR, are not just the result of a wrong approach to specific questions of interethnic communal life but are also the consequence of a certain weakening of the socialist and spiritual and ideological foundations on which society rests. This is precisely where the origin of the painful phenomena with which we have been confronted in the sphere of interethnic relations is to be sought. It is against this backdrop that the actions of the politicking circles, nationalist elements, and subversive anti-Soviet forces have to be viewed. And this means that the solution of ethnic problems is possible only as part of the full-blooded process of perestroyka which guarantees the democratization of all aspects of social life and the strengthening of the ideological base of socialism.

We are convinced that this process will be facilitated by placing the rights and obligations of the Russian Federation on an equal footing within the framework of a united soviet federal state. During the initial stages of Soviet history, when our republic was relatively more highly developed, a certain overlap of Russian and unionwide party and state structures was advantageous for the whole country and facilitated the redistribution of economic, political, and cultural energy in the intrerests of all the peoples. Today, on the other hand, when the other union republics have grown stronger, the imperfection of the RSFSR's economic and political mechanisms has become disadvantageous for the country as a whole, and above all for the nations and ethnic groups in Russia itself.

As is known, the republic's public is calling ever more insistently for the formation in the Russian Federation of adminstrative-management structures analogous to those which exist in other union republics, and for the enhancement of the status of autonomous formations. The RSFSR Supreme Soviet and Council of Ministers have already submitted to the party Central Committee and the USSR Government and Supreme Soviet appropriate proposals on the recreation of a Ministry of Internal Affairs, the establishment of a single republic system of material and technical supply, the creation of a Russian Academy of Sciences, and the development of information organs—press, radio, and television—in the RSFSR, and a number of other proposals.

The Russian public, the speaker said, is offended and perplexed by the negative elements occurring with regard to Russians in some republics. They are also perturbed by our domestic difficulties in resolving the nationalities question. These are primarily how to finally overcome the injustice allowed during the years of Stalinshchina against a whole series of peoples of the RSFSR moved by force from their homes? How to improve the socioeconomic development level of the northern ethnic groups? How to expand the rights of autonomous formations? The solution of all these problems must be approached very attentively and thoughtfully. One thing is clear, all these complex and acute questions must be resolved with a consideration for the national interests of all peoples within the framework of our Soviet federation, on the basis of the principles of socialism.

In our opinion, the plenum should define the procedure for the formation of the elements of sociopolitical structures lacking in RUssia. The draft platform on this score formulated fundamental approaches. They do not give rise to objections. But it would be worth thinking about lending them specific form in individual decisions. As is well known, the opinion is being voiced that it is necessary to form a Russian organization within the framework of the CPSU. The AUCCTU and Komsomol Central Committee plenums discussed the need to create corresponding Russian structures in these organizations too. And we should obviously adopt a specific stance on these issues, weighing all the pros and cons. It is probably expedient to instruct the Central Committee Politburo to introduce a proposal on the formation of a Central Committee bureau for the RSFSR and to set a deadline for convening a conference of the RSFSR party organizations.

Of course, putting Russia's status in order within the framework of the union state in no way diminishes the importance of its institutions, including their coordinating role on questions relating to the competence of the union republics.

There is no doubt that we are acting correctly when, in formulating the concept in the field of ethnic relations, we single out in particular the question of the party. All our experience confirms that only a united party can ensure a truly international approach toward the development of society as a whole and each of its component parts. We cannot interpret in a simplified manner the interconnection between political and economic democracy when it is a case of relations between republics.

We cannot in party affairs advance through those force fields which are formed by economic accountability and market relations and we cannot introduce the principles of subsidies and taxes into party policy. Imparting more modern forms to the principles of democratic centralism, which unites the CPSU into a single entity, is another matter.

In conclusion V.I. Vorotnikov said that the CPSU is vitally interested in ensuring that its activity take account of the broadest possible spectrum of views. The

proposal seems very timely that there be a fuller elaboration of the statutory clauses guaranteeing the opportunity for the all-around discussion of different alternative political decisions and freedom of opinion and ruling out any restrictions or discrimination against a particular section of party members in the minority in taking decisions while, of course, preventing any factional activity. At the same time, he stressed, the party must be more open with regard to the progressive, really progressive mass movements, fronts, and informal groups.

G.G. Gumbaridze, first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee, mounted the rostrum. He noted that Lenin's principle of the nations' self-determination is becoming the most important factor of the further democratization of our multinational state and this convincingly reveals the objective natural logic of perestroyka. Over the past decades we were so successful in creating a unitary state and so emasculated the very idea of the nations' political and economic sovereignty that today the boldest decisions have been justified, making it possible effectively to involve national initiative in the creative process of perestroyka. In our view this provision of M.S. Gorbachev's report most accurately reflects the main idea and task of the present Central Committee Plenum. And I think that it is precisely in this perspective that the CPSU draft platform in the field of nationalities policy at the present stage which has been submitted should be examined and seriously worked on.

We are a long way from illusions that all interethnic problems will be eliminated of their own accord in our country by tomorrow. It is impossible to resolve them at a stroke, especially in a country inhabited by over 120 nations, each of which has its own culture, history, language, and unique way of thinking. Being realists means singling out the key element. And there is no doubt that the union republics, the entire package of questions connected with the expansion of their rights and power as truly sovereign states—the basic nucleus of the new political structure for the country's management—should be the point of departure at this stage.

Speaking of the centrifugal tendencies and the problems of consolidation, the speaker said that the draft party platform is recognized by the Georgian public to be as a whole a realistic contribution to Lenin's nationalities policy and to the improvement of interethnic relations yet nonetheless it also does not enshrine these rights adequately and sometimes contains mutually exclusive provisions, which has been reflected in our comments and proposals sent to the CPSU Central Committee.

The effectiveness of these decisions can be ensured only as a result of completely rejecting stagnation stereotypes and granting the republics the opportunity in the majority of cases to decide independently and voluntarily, proceeding from specific features, which functional duties can in their view be justifiably delegated to the center. For that it is necessary above all substantially to expand information channels. We have even lifted the curtain on military expenditure, but that is only the beginning. The peoples have the right to trustworthy knowledge about how the collective funds accumulated in the union budget are being spent and how far that accords with their interests.

G.G. Gumbaridze spoke of the need for greater differentiation in implementing centrally financed large-scale economic projects depending on the specific interest of particular republics.

The expansion of national factors in all spheres without exception, he continued, is an enormous resource of ours and an inexhaustible reserve making it possible to ensure the continuity of the peoples' most valuable political, social, economic, cultural, and moral traditions.

It is to this end that, at the initiative of the republican party organization and public, the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee has elaborated a draft concept of the Georgian SSR's national development. The draft proceeds from the republic's specific features and is based on rich experience of its national-state development. It considers comprehensively the multiplicity of forms of ownership, natural and geographical conditions, historical and psychological factors, the population's specific needs and traditions, the way of life, and regional features. Within the framework of the concept the basic avenues of demographic policy, the improvement and regulation of migration processes, and the substantial normalization of the ecological situation will be determined.

Substantial tasks are planned to activate fundamental spheres of spiritual life like public education, science, and culture.

It is of fundamental importance that this document should be based on the task of organically including all peoples living in Georgia in the process of general national creation. In our view this should really help to reduce interethnic tension which, as throughout the country as a whole, has emerged recently, including just before the plenum.

We also see the key to the solution of the problem in the expansion of the union republics' rights with regard to regulating interethnic relations on their own territories, which should be reflected more clearly in the CPSU platform. This is a natural historical process based on many centuries of experience and on today's realities. Experience has convinced us that encroachment on the sovereignty of the republic in resolving vexed questions in this sphere merely aggravates problems and makes them chronic. There are obvious symptoms of excesses on interethnic soil often being preprogrammed and aimed at demanding the introduction of curfew or special form of control and therefore at renouncing democratic principles and turning from the course which has been assumed. There is even the feeling that some actions are artificially provoked to back up certain theorizations and schemes in the field of interethnic relations.

All this, as the report plainly notes, has an extremely pernicious effect on perestroyka. We have not yet learned to accept tolerantly, with the necessary understanding and composure, individual diametrically opposed, even radical, opinions. Many people are troubled that we are actually raising the question of, for instance, republican citizenship, the place where draftees undergo military service, or the resurrection of national army formations which, incidentally, reliably stood the test in the Great Patriotic War. At the same time for some reason there is a far calmer perception when formulas for recarving borders are issued with unwonted ease and attempts are made to squeeze interethnic problems into standardized arithmetical formulas, ignoring the peoples' thousands of years of history and pushing them toward expressing their mutual grievances, which leads only to the heating of passions. Their political acumen is obviously letting some people down.

The speaker then said that during the recent events which occurred on interethnic soil in the republic many of the mass media not only sinned with regard to questions of tact but also displayed a total lack of objectivity. Conclusions cannot be built on the basis of a one-sided approach, without investigating the essence of processes and facts. It is unfair to level accusations against a people with many centuries of traditions of interethnic communication and living alongside representatives of over 80 nations for even the smallest of whom conditions have been created making it possible to preserve their uniqueness, culture, and language for centuries. We must approach with great understanding the problems of a small republic which nonetheless includes three autonomous formations—the Abkhaz and Adzhar autonomous republics and the South Osetian Autonomous Oblast—a republic where teaching in schools is in eight languages: Georgian, Russian, Abkhaz, Osetian, Armenian, Azerbaijani, Estonian, and Greek. Where radio programs are broadcast in 7 languages and newspapers printed in six. Constant concern is also displayed for satisfying the diverse cultural requirements of the Jewish, Kurdish, and other populations. For many years now in areas with a dense national minority population people have really enjoyed the rights of cultural autonomy, had the opportunity to teach their children in their native language, to train and promote national cadres, and to be representatives in leading organs. These forms took shape objectively, without any outside pressure, as a manifestation of the respectful attitude of the representatives of the indigenous nation, which has the right to demand the same respect for its own culture, traditions, and language.

Speaking of the centuries-old fraternal ties linking the Georgian and Abkhaz peoples, the speaker noted that it would be wrong not to note everything which Soviet power has given Abkhaziya over the decades of its existence, primarily in its national development under conditions of autonomy. Does it not say a lot that right now in multinational Abkhaziya, where the Abkhazians comprise slightly over 17 percent of the population, national Abkhazian cadres hold up to 40 percent of the seats in local elected organs and over half the leading political and economic posts.

Having described the measures which the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee has undertaken to develop the Abkhaz culture and improve the population's living standard in Abkhaziya, the speaker said that only someone who, under cover of national interests, is seeking to further his own selfish aspirations and ambitions, only a blatant opponent of perestroyka, could under these conditions criminally encroach on the peace and calm of his people and provoke interethnic conflict on land which historically has never known such conflicts. Right now an investigation is under way under the strict supervision of the USSR Prosecutor's office and with the participation of representatives of the law enforcement organs of several union republics. Everything will be established objectively and truth and veracity will undoubtedly prevail.

The interethnic dialogue which has begun in Abkhaziya and the determination of the Communists of the oblast party organization, of all inhabitants of the autonomous republic, of Abkhazians, Georgians, Russians, Armenians, Greeks, and of our entire republic to overcome the difficulties which have arisen instill confidence and optimism so as to avoid creating problems for our union in the future.

The problem of the development of interethnic relations and the intensification of national self awareness are a very complex reality of our days and an inalienable feature of perestroyka. And there is no alternative to this on the democratic road. The other road is only confrontation.

That is why our party, which has firmly embarked on the path of renewal, must become for the peoples, for the working people, the main uniting political force, turning its face toward national problems, engaging in them in earnest, and must ensure consolidation, asserting new principles of its nationalities policy. The republican party organizations, acting through the Communists, must find mutually acceptable compromises and solutions for all questions, in no circumstances allowing their ranks to be split along national lines.

Our future, the destiny of perestroyka, and the transition of our society to a truly democratic type of life depend on the successful management of affairs in this supremely important sphere.

The famous aphorism of our immortal forebear: "Anyone who does not seek friends is his own worst enemy" has turned out to be surprisingly topical in today's crucial and complex period of the restructuring of the country's life begun by the party. These words of wisdom are the foundation of any nation's development and prosperity.

Today, V.I. Potapov, first secretary of Irkutsk party obkom, said, a question is being discussed on whose

resolution the fate of our multinational union will essentially depend. Interethnic problems have become the main watershed in the struggle between healthy restructuring forces and those who, by exploiting our difficulties, would like to torpedo the processes of renewal and realize their own arrogant, narrow, group aims. The situation is complicated by the fact that many social and ecological problems are unresolved, by the upsurge in emotions, and by the existence of certain deadlocked situations such as those, for instance, in Nagorno-Karabakh, Fergana, Abkhaziya, and other parts of the country.

We have often heard it argued, the speaker noted, that these problems are less acute in Siberia. Indeed, we have not had interethnic conflicts with severe consequences, and the process of liberating national self-awareness is mainly proceeding on a healthy basis. However, on this important issue there can be no greater or lesser problems, since the line of relations between nations and ethnic groups runs through people's hearts and minds. Communists are obliged to understand these problems solely as follows: The pain and worry of every family or person whose national rights and feelings are infringed should be the pain and worry of our entire party and our entire state.

Siberia is a multiracial region in terms of its population. In Irkutsk Oblast, for instance, there are large groups of people from the most varied nationalities—Tatars, Ukrainians, Belorussians, Tofalars, Evenkis, and others. There is the Ust-Orda Buryat Autonomous Okrug with a population of more than 130,000. All these nations and ethnic groups were also affected by the stagnant nationalities policy that led to the emergence of acute social problems, the deformation of their ways of life, the loss of many indigenous cultural and linguistic traditions, and the weakening of the interest shown, particularly by young people, in their peoples' history. For instance, more than half of all children of Buryat nationality do not learn their native language. This distortion is now being rectified.

The speaker fully supported the position set forth in the report that one of the main reasons for the tension in the sphere of interethnic relations is the extremely uneven nature of social development in a number of regions and the infringement of their interests because of departmental diktat and distortions in investment policy. Irkutsk Oblast is typical in this respect too. With less than 1 percent of the population it produces around 2 percent of national income, a considerable amount of electricity, aluminum, timber, pulp, and chemical, petroleum, and other output. And what does it have in return? A lower living standard compared with other oblasts and regions and a tangible lag in the supply of meat, milk, fruit, and vegetables and in the provision of housing, schools, hospitals, kindergartens, and other social, cultural, and leisure facilities. A rayon coefficient of around 20 percent is clearly out of line with the oblast's contribution to the all-union coffers and the severe living conditions faced by Siberians.

All these questions are now becoming political, causing righteous dissatisfaction among working people and turning into sources of social and interethnic conflict. That is why the platform's position on the economic substance of the self-determination and sovereignty implied in the transition of republics, krays, and oblasts to economic accountability and self-financing is exceptionally important in improving and strengthening the Soviet federation and national autonomy. This fully squares with the idea of regional economic accountability, models of which are now being actively developed in many of the country's oblasts and cities, including Irkutsk Oblast.

However, making a positive assessment of the party document as a whole, the speaker stressed that it neither is fully comprehensive nor seeks ways toward full equal rights. Take the question of the restructuring of the legal status and national-state makeup of the RSFSR. The fact that these problems are being tackled separately is a good thing. But, in the speaker's view, their elaboration has been half-hearted and does not take account of the new realities that have recently emerged in the country. On the one hand, we advocate granting genuine independence to the republics; on the other, we create an unequal position, particularly on the questions of party and social building.

The line in the platform about creating within the CPSU Central Committee structure a Central Committee bureau to work with Russian party organizations does not remove the problem, in his view. On the contrary, it creates an inefficient new level of party administration. Why, the speaker asked in reference to the 1966 abolition by the 23d CPSU Congress of the Central Committee Bureau for the RSFSR, should we return to failed, old structures? We should go forward in resolving this issue. The question of the creation of a Russian Communist Party with its own Central Committee should be examined, at our discretion, in the very near future.

Concerning the running of the Russian economy, he noted that it seemed to him that the regional approach is the most successful form of economic management. It makes it possible to establish historical justice with regard to Russia and wholly accords with the principles of equal rights for the union republics.

Certain provisions of the platform, in the speaker's opinion, need to be fleshed out and worded more clearly. This applies above all to the determination of the powers and authority of the union republics, as well as to questions of ownership. In his view, part of the formula "a strong union, strong republics" has not been argued sufficiently strongly. It should be borne in mind that the transition to economic accountability and self-financing by republics and regions, while being a positive initiative, also contains the potential for the emergence of conflict in the sphere of interethnic relations and a growth in isolationist sentiments, which is already being seen on questions of output deliveries. Let us be blunt: Discipline in this area, the speaker stated, has virtually

disappeared. The speaker put forward the proposal that the regulation and coordination of these issues should be left to the central authorities to a certain extent.

He also noted that even on the question of ownership the role of the union is viewed in a schematic and, if it is possible to say so, shallow way. Bearing in mind the exceptional importance of the matter, the speaker proposed discussing the question of leaving enterprises of defense significance, metallurgical complex enterprises, and railroad and air transport enterprises under union ownership.

He also expressed his attitude to the delicate issue of the self-determination principle. As is well known, legal norms relating to this question are enshrined in the USSR Constitution and the CPSU platform. But in political and social practice, in the speaker's view, the possibility and need for isolating certain republics from the union should be differentiated. Thus, he cited the example that in the Baltic republics only the question of possible secession from the USSR is being actively advocated, while few people are discussing whether this step is needed at the moment or whether it accords with the interests of the Lithuanian, Estonian, or Latvian peoples as a whole. Who, ultimately, has studied the real opinions of all Baltic working people? As a Communist, the speaker said, I would like to ask my comrades from the Baltic whether everything has been done and is being done to channel the awareness of Communists, the working class, the kolkhoz peasantry, and the intelligentsia in the direction of creating stability and mutual understanding between nations and ethnic groups. Nobody is unaffected by this issue. Communists and working people in Irkutsk Oblast are following events in the Baltic republics with particular alarm and concern. People sometimes fail to understand the paradoxical situation prevailing in the region. On the one hand, as we are well aware, the Baltic republics are the initiators of many restructuring processes. They have been given extensive opportunities to develop economic independence. On the other hand, this region today poses the greatest danger to perestroyka.

In this respect the speaker recalled the speeches made by a number of people's representatives at the first Congress of People's Deputies warning of possible, even unpredictable consequences in the Baltics.

Unfortunately, it looks as though the voice of the people's deputies, backed by thousands of people, was not heeded. Matters here are becoming increasingly serious. This is shown, in his view, by the revelations of Professor Made, who made an abusive outburst about the Russian people, by the mockery of Soviet state symbols, and by the desecration of memorials and military cemeteries. There is frenzied nationalism and chauvinism and the kindling of ethnic strife, the speaker said, but the law is silent, although no one has abolished liability for these illegal actions. The speaker agreed with Comrade Afanasyev's remark in his speech that the Communists opposing the implementation of party platforms must also bear responsibility.

The speaker stressed that the economy is being emphatically destabilized on the pretext of solving nationalities questions. The knot of social problems is being pulled tighter and tighter, and then people are beginning to relish these ills and use them to assail those who are doing at least something for the cause. He cited the words of French philosopher Michel Montaigne, who said: "Those who shake a state system are usually the first to perish when it collapses."

In the speaker's opinion, a certain degree of tolerance on the part of the party Central Committee Politburo when it comes to preventing the party from coming apart at the seams, so to speak, and the economy from tottering is incomprehensible. With the utmost conviction and resolve he supported what was said in the report regarding the need to establish discipline and order everywhere. He also totally supported the CPSU Central Committee Statement on the Situation in the Baltic Republics. The speaker noted that it is no longer enough merely to make assessments and note facts. Resolute practical actions are needed. For the sake of the future it is necessary to defend the fundamental values of the proletarian internationalism of the Soviet federation.

In conclusion V.I. Potapov stated that events in the sphere of interethnic relations have cogently confirmed yet again that at the present historical stage the CPSU alone is the real guarantor of perestroyka and the consolidation of all healthy forces in society. Therefore the task of the party Central Committee and all Communists now, more than ever before, is in practice—precisely in practice—to cherish the party's unity like the apple of their eye.

A.-M.K. Brazauskas, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, mounted the rostrum. I think, he said, that today we should determine the main links in the chain of interethnic relations which, if we grab them, will enable us to pull out the entire chain. One such link is a very complex question and one that requires immediate solution, which can be formulated as follows: Either a real union of equal sovereign states, republics, as defined in our constitution, a union in which they will really have both political and economic interest, is created, or efforts to build a democratic socialist state may be thwarted.

We all, the speaker stressed, must admit that the situation in various parts of the country attests precisely to the latter at present. Today interethnic contradictions are, on the one hand, an expression of extremely acute socioeconomic problems and, on the other hand, an expression of contradictions between the interests of individual union republics and a centralized state.

Therefore it would be incorrect to regard what is happening in the republic today as a purely local phenomenon. These processes are a reflection of deep-seated movements taking place within the party and the country as a whole. Their acuteness and unfamiliarity are yet another argument in favor of recognizing the fact that political and socioeconomic processes in the Lithuanian SSR are proceeding more intensively. This is fraught with a certain danger. This concern was reflected in the CPSU Central Committee Statement on the Situation in the Soviet Baltic Republics.

Assessing the situation in Lithuania, the speaker noted that it is characterized by a heightened intensity of political passions, activeness on the part of broad strata of the population, and swift growth of their national self-awareness. The Lithuanian Communist Party and also the "Sajudis" informal social movement are at the center of political life. Their mutual relations determine to a decisive extent the direction and the polarity of the processes under way in Lithuania. Along with this glasnost and democratization have enabled a large number of informal organizations of various tendencies to enter the political arena. Some of them call themselves parties.

They usually put forward extremely categorical slogans and stage actions that are often in the focus of attention of people visiting Lithuania. But in the republic, the speaker said, these forces, as a rule, meet with no particular support. Therefore the position of the central mass media, which draw broad generalizations and conclusions from individual facts and on this basis mold public opinion, is unacceptable and does not serve to strengthen mutual understanding between peoples.

The Lithuanian Communist Party, the speech noted, is fighting its way into the people's consciousness through mighty layers of mistrust that has very deep historical roots and serious socioeconomic causes. The only way to gain the masses' trust is by becoming deeply imbued with the people's aspirations and interests and by taking radical and resolute political steps. So the familiar slogan "The party's plans are the people's plans!" now sounds different: "The people's plans are the party's plans!" The slogan is supported by the people because it is not merely a rearrangement of the words. Lithuania's Communists are well aware that you can lead in the new conditions only when you are deeply conscious of the processes that are under way and of people's interests, you have a clear idea of ways of solving problems, and you receive a mandate for such leadership.

Speaking of the forces in the republic for which independence and sovereignty are connected with secession from the Soviet Union, the first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee stressed that the position of the Communists and the position of all sober-minded people in the republic is unequivocal: Lithuania is so integrated within the union economy and has such political, cultural, and simply human ties that it would be disastrous to break them. The Lithuanian people want friendly, equal relations with our immediate neighbors: Russians, Belorussians, Letts, and others. We believe, the speaker said, that in the modern world there are no and can be no isolated, absolutely independent states and peoples. In this interconnected world each state and nation is sovereign inasmuch as it can independently choose the content and form of dependence, that is, inasmuch as it voluntarily renounces some of its rights for the sake of, in our instance, unionwide aims. Such is the normal condition of civilized, democratically organized states, which is what the Lithuanian Communist Party is seeking.

Sovereignty is not only a goal. It is also a means of achieving a higher quality of life and living standards for the people. It must ensure the development of a society free from the residual deformations of the past and proof against their recurrence in the future. Such independence must become an organic part of all our relations—economic, political, and state. Much has already been designated in the draft CPSU platform and in the decisions of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies. Much has yet to be found. The quest is also under way in our republic. We believe, the speech stressed, that our state's structure as a union of equal states is a qualitatively higher stage of development than a federation.

The worsening of interethnic relations has also been brought about by an increasingly deteriorating economic situation. A way out of the crisis lies in granting the republics economic autonomy. This by no means implies isolationism but, on the contrary, envisages extensive mutually beneficial ties with other republics and other states. Economic autonomy cannot be implemented without granting autonomy to all enterprises and organizations situated on the territory of an individual republic, be they interdepartmental, interrepublic, or interstate. Only then can every republic and every economy function effectively. That is the heart of the economic might of the entire country. This is also set out in the USSR draft Law on Economic Autonomy which, we hope, will be approved by the session of the country's Supreme Soviet. This would also constitute a vote of confidence from the people for the republic's Communist Party also. It is well known that the sphere of international relations is a very complex and often painful problem and a sphere that suffered severe damage owing to Stalin's nationalities policy.

The speaker pointed out that, while condemning the administrative-edict methods which became established in the sphere of nationalities policy, the historical section of the CPSU platform nonetheless cites and condemns with insufficient precision Stalin's crimes against the peoples of the USSR, notably the Lithuanian people. In Lithuania alone 1 in 10 people were unjustifiably sentenced to deportation. Unequivocally condemning Stalin's policy aimed against the Soviet peoples, the Lithuanian Communist Party quite definitely opposes the idea of equating Stalinism with the Russian people or any other people in our country (as some people are doing). That is our principled stance, the speaker said.

We fully support, he continued, the party's course of renewing its nationalities policy, including its efforts to provide the requisite conditions for the preservation of the cultural traditions and languages of ethnic groups who live outside their territorial-state formations. However, we believe that the line of creating national areas requires serious substantiation. Thus, under the influence of this provision of the draft platform, and for other reasons, of course, a movement has begun in our republic in favor of creating Polish territorial areas, that is, a movement to autonomize a nation which has its own state formation alongside the Lithuanian SSR; moreover this movement began on age-old Lithuanian territory which was occupied by landowning Poland only for the space of 2 decades (until 1939).

That is why, when suggesting this kind of model of autonomization, all the complex historical elements that have occurred in the fate of many neighboring peoples must also be taken into account, otherwise we will give rise to new conflicts instead of solving the problem or problems.

We support, the speaker said, the provision in the draft platform that says that "giving real political and economic substance to our federation presupposes new approaches to party building."

It is obvious today that the current CPSU Program and Statues have in many respects come into conflict with the real perestroyka of the Union's renewal and are in need of radical changes. That is why many of Lithuania's Communists believe that the degree of the republic's political and economic autonomy necessitates identical autonomy for its leading political force—its Communist Party.

Life convincingly shows that democratic changes within the party must proceed more rapidly than changes in society as a whole. Otherwise the party will inevitably lag behind the political processes taking place in society. The current status of the union republics' communist parties does not accord with the legal position of the sovereign republics within the USSR. These and several other factors have been conducive to many of Lithuania's party organizations putting forward the idea of renewing the autonomy of the republic's Communist Party with its own Statutes and Program in line with historical realities, specific national features, and the future sovereignty of the republic.

We must also take into account the fact that throughout the history of its existence the Lithuanian Communist Party has never really been an independent political force. It was only allocated the role of executor. This is all also reflected today in the debates within the Lithuanian Communist Party. This formulation of the question inevitably brings up the problem of renewing and changing the organizational structure of the CPSU, which is in fact based today on the principles of centralism, rather than on the principles of democratic centralism as Lenin saw it. The first steps have already been taken along this road, and that is very important. However, we must carry on and advance further, more boldly, although, of course, this is a very complex question. We must approach its resolution in a very well-conceived and well-considered fashion; we cannot evade it by any means.

Any delay works against the party itself, the first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee said in conclusion. In our view, the union republics' communist parties must—as independent component parts of the CPSU forming a union of like-minded parties—participate in the formation of leading organs and the shaping of all policy. It is the principle of parity based on the ideology of renewal and democracy that should unite us and strengthen the organization of the whole country's Communists. Relations between the CPSU and the union republics' communist parties will change in the course of perestroyka, depending on the progress it makes and the creative activity carried out by the party organizations. The desire for autonomy must not be regarded today as the partition of the CPSU. The perestroyka of the party necessitates innovative decisions inasmuch as perestroyka itself is proceeding along an innovative path.

The floor was given to Yu.D. Maslyukov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee [Gosplan].

The draft platform that has been submitted to the plenum for discussion, he said, has been formulated with consideration for its nationwide discussion and contains a well-argued concept for the harmonization of interethnic relations within the USSR. The critical analysis of their development in the country throughout the years of Soviet power cited in the draft platform provides a clear picture of our achievements in resolving this question and reveals the main reasons behind the worsening of nationalities problems. One of these, as M.S. Gorbachev noted in his report, is the imperfect nature of economic relations and of the management system of the national economic complex.

Without belittling the considerable economic and social achievements made by all the union republics within the framework of the single economic complex, I must point out that the management methods that prevailed in previous years had a number of adverse consequences, many management functions were unwarrantedly gathered in the center, while the economic base and the rights of the union republics were restricted. All this caused the weakening of interest on the part of the republics and regions, and their reduced opportunity to influence the development process as a whole, the results of economic activity carried out by enterprises situated on their territory, and the efficiency of production. The result of this was a reduction in their role and responsibility for improving the population's living conditions and—of

late—their responsibility for the complication of interregional and interethnic relations.

The economic substance of self-determination and sovereignty under contemporary conditions, as noted in the draft platform, takes the form of republics' transition to economic accountability [khozraschet] and self-financing. This is one of the most important areas in the radical economic reform being implemented within the country.

The nationwide discussion of the draft general principles for the perestroyka of the leadership of the economy and the social sphere in the union republics and the examination at the Supreme Soviet of the proposal put forward by the Lithuanian and Estonian SSR's for these republics to switch to economic autonomy have accelerated the elaboration of a concept of the transition to khozraschet and self-financing in other union and autonomous republics, oblasts, and krays in the Russian Federation.

These documents provide for the special features and levels of development of particular regions and their specialization within the national economic complex to be taken into account. This is, in principle, the correct approach but, while acknowledging the diversity of forms and methods of realizing economic accountability in the union republics, it is necessary to ensure equal rights for all in resolving economic questions and enhancing economic independence and the close combination of the republics' interests with all-state interests within the country's unified national economic complex.

The Gosplan, together with other economic organs of the union republic councils of ministers, Moscow Gorispolkom, and Moscow Oblispolkom, is carrying out specific preparatory work on the transfer of the union republics, Moscow, Moscow Oblast, and certain other oblasts and cities to the principles of economic accountability and self-financing as of 1990.

The speaker recalled that on 1 September this year a government resolution was adopted on priority measures to transfer the Belorussian SSR to the new management conditions as of 1990. It provides for the implementation of a package of measures to extend the republic's sphere of management and its independence in managing socioeconomic development and strengthening the financial base.

The transfer of approximately 50 enterprises, organizations, and establishments of union subordination to the republic's jurisdiction has been defined, and 5 union republic ministries and committees of the Belorussian SSR have been transformed into corresponding republic organs of management. At the same time the resolution on the Belorussian SSR defines that work on transferring enterprises will be continued. The publication of this resolution is of very great significance, because Belorussia is the first republic to prepare for the transfer in accordance with the elaborated principles and the draft law on republic economic accountability and self-financing.

In accordance with the USSR Supreme Soviet resolution of 27 July this year, preparations are being made for the Lithuanian SSR, the Latvian SSR, and the Estonian SSR to go over to economic accountability 1 January 1990. The principles of the formation of the republics' budgets under the new management conditions, of the transfer of enterprises to the jurisdiction of these republics' councils of ministers, and of cooperation between union and republic organs, questions of the functioning of the finance and credit system, and a number of others are being drawn up.

The speaker went on to say that existing disagreements of a fundamental nature are preventing the completion of this important work. The concept of the Baltic republics proceeds from the condition of their exclusive ownership of natural resources; the transfer of all enterprises of union subordination to republic ownership, with a certain exception, as in the Latvian SSR's proposals; the implementation of an independent policy—independent of all-union policy—in the spheres of finances, credit, and price formation. It is proposed to regulate all economic relations on the republics' territories only by means of republic laws and to build relations with the USSR and other republics on treaty principles.

The adoption of the concepts proposed by the Baltic republics, the speaker said, could have serious negative consequences. In the interests not only of the union as a whole but also of each union republic it is necessary not to restrict oneself to one's own territory but to work toward the development of a single market. Then many questions will be resolved not to the detriment of each other but in the interests of all and of the country as a whole.

The speaker dwelt in particular on the Baltic republics' proposal to transfer all enterprises to their jurisdiction, including enterprises in the most important all-union systems. He expressed the firm conviction that this could lead to a drop in the efficiency of social production owing to underutilization of the advantages of territorial division of labor. For example, ferrous and nonferrous metallurgy has developed historically along the path of creating units of large unit capacity with strongly developed collaboration in respect of raw materials, energy, and semimanufactures. A high degree of specialization in rolling and other units has been implemented in the interests of the entire national economy, not only of individual regions. In addition, it is necessary to take account of the high capital-intensiveness of metallurgical production, which requires the concentration of resources in the most important areas of its development for the national economy, the centralization of the investment process, the wide involvement of planning organizations, and the mobilization of technical thought and of the forces of the country's specialized construction organizations and machine-building enterprises.

Or let us take another proposal—to organize an independent Lithuanian railroad. It is known that mainline forms of transport, and railroad transport above all, are

an extraterritorial system which ensures the vital activity of the national economic complex of the country as a whole, including defense and foreign economic tasks. Consequently, these forms of transport must be developed and managed at an all-union level. If we speak of the economic aspect of the question, preliminary estimates show that in this case, given the same volumes of shipments, the working pool of locomotives must be increased by almost 150 units, and the complement of locomotive teams by more than 1,200 people. This additional expenditure alone will total approximately R85 million a year. Such a proposal can hardly be considered economically justified, because nothing compensates for the said expenditure. Instead of increasing investments in the development of the railroad economy and satisfying the railroad workers' social needs—which is what the authors of the proposal to create an independent Lithuanian railroad are reckoning on—in fact, these investments will be reduced.

M.S. Gorbachev's report showed what will happen if all enterprises producing fuel and energy resources are transferred to the republics' jurisdiction and granted the right to dispose of these resources themselves, as the Lithuanian and Estonian SSR's propose. At the same time it must be borne in mind that the adoption in full of the concept of the Baltic union republics' economic independence substantially reduces the union organs' potential for equalizing the levels of development of individual regions and opening up new rayons.

Union organs will not be in a position to oblige the union republics to supply other republics with the necessary quantity of particular resources since even union laws, according to the Baltic republics' proposal, will have force only after their approval by the republics. The autonomization of the economy could have the consequence of increasing differences in the rates and levels of the republics' economic development and in the people's living standards and result in the deepening, not the resolution, of national contradictions.

Taking into account the complexity of the problem of the union republics' transfer to economic accountability and self-financing and the incomplete elaboration of many theoretical questions, above all problems of ownership, and mindful that corresponding laws have not been adopted and that there is no legal backup, the speaker considers it expedient to transfer the republics and regions to eonomic independence gradually. This fundamental point was discussed and supported at the meeting at the CPSU Central Committee with the leadership of the Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian SSR's 13 September this year.

Proceeding from this, we regard 1990 as the transitional stage to realizing the new management mechanism. This does not exclude extending the degree of the republics' independence or the transfer of individual enterprises to them at this stage. But in order to have a guarantee of the normal functioning of the whole national economic complex, it is necessary first to ensure a high level of economic independence for enterprises as the basic component of our management system.

The preparation of union republics for transition to the principles of self-management and self-financing within the framework of the radical economic reform being implemented in the country demanded the elaboration of fresh approaches toward the formulation of the 1990 state plan for economic and social development in terms of indicators being set for union republics. Thus, as part of the state plan, union republic Councils of Ministers will be set and assigned only state orders for the delivery of the most important categories of industrial output and nonfood goods, the delivery of foodstuffs and agricultural raw materials to all-union stocks, and the commissioning of the most important production capacities and environmental protection projects. This also applies to quotas of state centralized capital investments and material and technical resources, including those for the agor-industrial complex.

It is suggested, the speaker said, to abandon the practice of republics being assigned state orders for the volume of sale of paid services, retail trade turnover, and the commissioning of projects in the social and cultural spgeres and municipal services. These questions will be autonomously resolved by union republic Councils of Ministers.

In contrast with the other republics, the union republics in the Baltic region and the Belrossuian SSR, which will switch to the principle of economic accountability in 1990, shall be set overall quotas of state centralized capital investment without breaking them down into sectors and fields. Deliveries of nonfood goods to all-Union stocks will be set only in physical terms. This will ensure a flexible system of plan target setting. Specifically, it is envisaged that the set plan indicators, including next year's quotas, will be amended by the USSR State Planning Committee [Gosplan] as the relevant enterprises and association now under union jurisdiction are handed over to these republics' Councils of Ministers.

In conclusion, the speaker said that the proposals contained in the report and speeches presuppose that industry's base sectors, the system of industry's defense sectors, rail, maritime, and air transport, communications, and power supply should still remain under the center's jurisdiction. Later on, as economic accountability relations are developed, the republics' functions and rights in some sectors will be expanded.

For the 2d year running, S.G. Arutyunyan, first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, said, the press and television have been using no more and no less than the words "seething" and "explosive" to describe our region. What is it that turned into a seething cauldron? Let us not yield to inertia and bring up failures in the economy and the neglect of the social sphere, even though they do occur. The role of detonator was played

primarily by blatant deformations in the nationalities question which were spotlighted by glasnost and perestroyka.

Those who seek identical causes of the exacerbation of interethnic relations in all republics and the corresponding universal prescriptions for resolving the conflicts are greatly deluded. Every region has its own specific features, and the correct approaches cannot be found unless they are understood.

The current sociopolitical situation in Armenia is affected by both the echo of the past and the realities of the present. By dint of historical circumstances, the people has been split in into parts which tend to pull toward each other. Over 2 million people living in diaspora, scattered in many countries in the world—this is bitter legacy of genocide. Approximately the same number of Armenians live outside the Armenian SSR, in different regions of the country.

Exacerbated by today's interethnic and natural disasters, historical memory has affected—and could not have failed to do so—the people's mentality, moods, and awareness. This is where, the speaker believes, one ought to seek the key to understanding what is happening in the republic today.

Laying all the responsibility on intrigues by extremists, he went on, would mean oversimplifying the essence of the matter and losing the opportunity to find the correct way out of the crisis situation.

Armenia is living through a stormy period. The increased political activeness of the masses, the delays in untangling the Karabakh knot, the escalation of tension in relations with Azerbaijan, and the blockade have created an atmosphere approaching critical point in the republic.

The Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet session which opened just before our plenum raised the question of a vote of confidence in the republic's Supreme Soviet Presidium. Some speeches also contained calls for expressing no confidence in union organs too.

How could it happen, deputies asked, that the 70th year of Soviet power is seeing the blood of innocent people being shed, a never-ending stream of refugees, and an action—unprecedented in the Soviet state's history—like the economic blockade of a union republic by its neighbor? Why is it that the country's parliament and government are not doing anything about this blockade, why is the central press keeping silent about it?

It is no accident, the speaker went on, that I raise these questions here at the plenum. There are extremely limited opportunities to settle the conflict using just the efforts by republican party organizations. This is most obviously demonstrated by a recent event. Accords reached during the meeting of the two bureaus of the neighboring republics' communist party cenhtral committees, were to all intents and purposes cancelled out and wrecked by economic pressure on Armenia and the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO]. The word "blockade," used only in wartime, became a reality. And the railroad through Georgia is now known as the "lifeline." But it can guarantee only 15 percent of planned shipments.

For the 2d month running, the speaker noted, Armenia has not received any freight along the Azerbaijan Railroad. The NKAO has been in economic isolation for over a year. There is a shortage of fuel even for emergency service vehicles. Construction and restoration work in the disaster zone has come to a standstill. Hundreds of detachments which have arrived from all over the country to help the earthquake victims are forced to stand idle. This is no longer an economic problem, it is a major political problem. Unless paper shipments get through to Armenia by 20 September, newspapers will not publish in the republic on 21 September and people will be unable to familiarize themselves with the present Central Committee plenum materials.

The dramatic nature and acuteness of the situation in the region, the speaker devlared, are aggravated by the bleeding wound of Nagornyy Karabakh. The NKAO question is not a metter of a territorial dispute between Armenia and Azerbaijan. In the speaker's opinion, it was raised not by Armenia but by the Nagorno-Karabakh people themselves. It must be viewed solely as a matter of the peoples' self-determination. It is a matter of the people expressing their will, of their sovereign right. Scorning this right, the speaker said, means discrediting the party's nationalities policy.

The CPSU platform correctly says that the Nagorno-Karabakh problem musy be solved on a constitutional-legal democratic basis, in an atmosphere of glasnost, and with participation by representatives of all interested sides without fail.

I think, S.G. Arutyunyan said, that fundamental importance attaches to the inclusion in this list of a nation's right to self-determination without which, as is well known, there can be no genuine democratic nationalities policy.

The situation must be realistically appraised. In the present conditions, with reciprocal mistrust, intolerance, and even enmity built up on both sides, the way out must be sought along the path of compromise. A sensible step in this direction, he believes, would be to give Nagorno-Karabakh the status of autonomous territory under Union jurisdiction—in other words, placing the NKAO really under the center with restoration of oblast party and soviet organs.

The strategy of the party's nationality policy, embodied in the CPSU platform, is today determined by the further development of the bases of socialist federalism, the deepening of the independence of union republics, the introduction of regional economic accountability, and a whole host of other cardinal steps. The speaker

deems it necessary to reiterate the general principle: The Soviet federation will be a union not just of union republics but also of autonomous formations. This will emphasize the fact that in our country there will be no people with greater or lesser rights, that all nations and ethnic groups will have equal independence and equal opportunities for spiritual, cultural, economic, and social development.

A situation has taken shape where major ethnic communities which have formed union republics have not just economic guarantees but also political guarantees of their development, which are enshrined in the Constitution, while ethnic minorities, even if they are densely settled in historical territories and enjoy autonomous status, do not always have such guarantees. The speaker then dwelt on the problems confronting ethnic minorities and groups.

It is necessary, he declared, to make our federation open, to grant the autonomous formations the right to submit proposals to the country's supreme organs on enhancing the status of autonomy. It may be possible to make provision for a system of contract relations between national-territorial formations based on the same lines as the relations between union republics and the Union of SSR's. In this event, in the speaker's opinion, the form of self-determination becomes universal.

What are the components [subyekt] of the federation: the territorial formations, or the peoples who make up the union? Without answering this question, the speaker said, it is impossible to find the key to improving, that is strengthening, the union.

Present-day realities categorically dictate the need to interpret the right of nations to self-determination, not so much from the angle of the possibility of specific republics withdrawing from the USSR as from the angle of the self-determination of peoples within the framework of the Soviet federation. Essentially, this is how the question is posed in the draft platform in respect of the autonomous formations in the Russian Federation. The speaker took the view that this principle could be applied throughout the entire Soviet federation.

Interethnic conflicts are a harsh reality, he said. Legal mechanisms for their settlement are still lacking in our country. The quest for such mechanisms has led to the conclusion that it should be possible to make provision in the USSR Constitution for the status of autonomous territory under union jurisdiction. This, the author believes, would make it possible to extinguish a fire as it flares up, right at the beginning, without allowing a situation to become irreversible.

Justice in relations between nations—this is the order of the day today, the speaker went on to say, and the Russian people should be among the first to taste that justice. For many years the main thrust of the nationalties policy was the provision of assistance to the periphery with a view to eliminating existing inequalities among peoples. This approach place a heavy burden on Russia's shoulders. Because of the vagueness of the attributes of statehood, the Russian Federation began to be associated with the center. And the criticism leveled at excessive centralization sometimes turns into criticism of Russia. We, the speaker said, wholeheartedly support the proposals contained in the draft platform aimed at securing a worthy place for Russia within the federation of union republics.

Many party committees at local level were caught napping by the rapid rise of national self-awareness, by the population's justified presentation of overdue sociopolitical and economic problems. Unsolved acute ethnic and social problems are threatening party organizations' authority.

We are frequently forced onto the sidelines, he went on, and frequently it is not we who have the initiative; we lose hold of the national flag, which is then seized by politicized associations and organizations that become the exponents of national aspirations.

True, he stressed the party must be above all the bearer of the international, integrating principles. However, in our multinational country international principles must be implemented through the satisfaction of the national aspirations of the peoples and ethnic groups of our Union.

While by no means denying personal responsibility, the speaker said, I would, at the same time like to note that the CPSU Central Committee and its Politburo have also quite often dragged their feet when it came to making political assessments and taking practical measures to disentangle "tight knots" in interthnic relations. There are questions which can and must be resolved by the USSR Supreme Soviet, the country's government, and the CPSU Central Committee, and we have a right to expect greater decisiveness and more consistency and promptness from them.

Despite the multifaceted nature of the problems in interethnic relations and the opinions and ways of resolving them, which are evident also in the current debate at our plenum, A.N. Girenko, first secretary of the Crimean Ukrainian Communist Party Oblast Committee, said, it is unquestionable that the complex and contradictory processes in this sphere which are accompanied by acute conflicts affect all Soviet people, leaving no one indifferent to what is happening in the Caucasus, Central Asia, the Baltic republics, or Moldavia. In conditions of democratization and glasnost, the growth of national self-awareness was a reaction to the distortion of the Leninist nationality policy, excessive centralization of political and economic power, and insufficient attention to national interests in the sphere of culture and everyday life especially of small peoples. However, this natural reaction has awakened not only the healthy forces. National movements today bear noticeably nationalist hues; the contradictoriness and acuteness of interethnic relations have moved these relations into the forefront of the perestroyka processes.

The successes of perestroyka, the speaker emphasized, are directly connected with the stability of our all-union home. This is a question of fundamental importance. The optimum combination of national and statewide interests in a voluntary union of the peoples of our multinational country constitutes the main principle of the approach to the solution of national contradictions in conditions of perestroyka.

M.S. Gorbachev's report at the plenum and the CPSU national platform take account of the totality of present-day factors and represent, in their content, the new concept and strategy of this historical process. This policy can only be translated into practice if every party committee and all Communists work consistently and persistently toward this aim. A great deal will depend on the clarity of the positions and the consistency of the actions of union republic communist party central committees.

The grassroots party aktiv is currently operating in a complex situation. Ethnic relations are complicated by economic instability and social problems which have exacerbated to breaking point. Passions and emotions sparked by rallies frequently stifle sensible undertakings. In organizational, ideological, and educational work the correct tone is not always found, socialist pluralism of opinions is not always adhered to, and priority is not always given to universal human values.

In these conditions it is extremely important to have clear theoretical guidelines. The speaker expressed the conviction that the plenum would make a major contribution to the modern theory of the nationality question.

It seems essential to further step up scientific and theoretical studies of nationality policy and the quest for new and unorthodox practical approaches to its implementation. It would be expedient to set up an all-union scientific research institute for problems in interethnic relations, with branches attached to union republic communist party central committees, and to create corresponding subdivisions at higher party schools for the in-depth study of the theory and practice of the nationality question by cadres of party and ideological workers.

It also appears expedient to examine the question of establishing at the CPSU Central Committee and in union, autonomous republic, kray, and some oblast party committees not just commissions—which is very important—but also departments on interthnic relations, naturally within the confines of current staffing.

In real life it is hard to draw the line beyond which progressive aspirations to national development turn into their opposite: claims to national exclusivity. Especially as every force, including extremist, nationalist forces, is using restructuring slogans—and, I must be frank, not without success—to draw supporters into their ranks. That is why it is important to create the kind of atmosphere and the kind of conditions in practice in which Soviet citizens can feel at home in any corner of our country, as stated in the CPSU platform. This is a criterion for correctly combining concern for national interests with internationalist positions.

Touching on the question of language, the speaker decisively supported the proposal in the report on the need to have an all-union, state Russian language. This coupled with the national state language in every republic could solve many conflicts.

The Crimea, the obkom first secretary continued, is well known to Soviet people as a resort with unique natural, climatic, and healing features that really is the property of all the people and the entire union. The Crimea is multiethnic and, at the same time, international. In addition to Russians, Ukrainians, Crimean Tatars, Krimchaks, and Karaims, this region is inhabited by Bulgarians, Uzbeks, Belorussians, Azerbaijanis, Armenians, Jews, Lithuanians, Estonians, Latvians, Greeks, Germans, Poles, and many others.

The Crimea also endured the upheavals connected with Stalinist deformations of national policy and sweeping accusations of treachery made against various peoples—against the Crimean Tatars in particular, who were deported to the country's eastern regions. The people still remember all this. They remember everything: the betrayal of the fascist stooges and the heroism of those who struggled for victory over the enemy at the front, in partisan detachments, and in the rear. And now, 45 years later, the problem of the Crimean Tatars, the majority of whom live outside the Crimea, is one of the factors seriously complicating the situation in this region. The new thinking and logic of restructuring compels us to find a solution to this extremely complex problem. The solution can only be found by combining the interests of the population living in the Crimea—and we are talking about 2.5 million people—with the national interests of the Crimean Tatars. In this respect the whole complex of present-day realities must be taken into account. Insufficiently clear orientation toward the development of the peninsula as a resort and a departmental approach to building sanatoria have led to distortions in the economy and exacerbated the whole complex of social and ecological problems. Suffice it to say that there are 152,000 people on the housing waiting list. A large chemical complex in the north of the oblast and a metallurgical plant in the east are alien additions to the region.

A source of particular concern not only to the inhabitants of the Crimea but to the country's broad public, the speaker continued, is the construction of the Crimean AES. For some reason the question of its conversion, which has been decided in practice, keeps being deferred.

The resettlement of the Crimean Tatars, which needs extra material and financial resources amounting to more than R1 billion, is possible only on the basis of a special state program including, in particular, the creation of new jobs, the construction of housing, education, and the appropriate infrastructure.

Now, the speaker continued, extremist-minded leaders of the Crimean Tatar national movement are inciting

their compatriots living outside the Crimea to sell their homes or to close them up, move into the oblast on a massive, uncontrolled scale, arbitrarily seize land to build on, and disobey the local authorities. This is causing people unwarranted suffering and prompting anti-Tatar feeling.

The speaker appealed to comrades from Uzbekistan and Krasnodar Kray, where a considerable number of Crimean Tatars live, with a request that they step up work right now to explain to these people all the harm caused by such hasty, ill-considered action. In his speech he raised the question of adopting a special law on the Crimea, which would define its special status within the present state structure. This decision would open up new opportunities for socioeconomic development and the harmonization of ethnic relations in the Crimea.

The tragic earthquake in Armenia, B.I. Oleynik, writer and deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities, said, through the gloom of mourning and despite all the cults and attacks by "champions" of restructuring, sharply highlighted that nobility of brotherhood which has been fostered in us by none other than the socialist system. At the same time, the tragedy also revealed the canker that has eaten its way deep into the state organism. What had outwardly appeared to be indestructible buildings disintegrated before our very eyes, revealing sand where there should have been cement.

It is bad when castles are built on sand. It is even worse when castles of sand are built on a rock plateau. It is terrible that this cement had been stolen by elementary swindlers from elementary buildings. But it is one hundred times more terrible that the stones from the foundations of our multiethnic cathedral have essentially been stolen over decades. The sovereignty of our republic, its language, history, and national dignity have been stolen in the name of a pathological theory of merging together or, to be more precise, in order to strengthen personal power.

If some people are still seeking the causes of the bleak state of our society in the biology of the socialist system, if they seek the causes of mismanagement, indiscipline, extravagance, laziness in flaws in the national character, I would venture to assure them that these things are only the results. The basic cause of all these sorry deformations lies in the violation of the root system, of the sense of attachment to the nest, and in the loss of respect for father, mother, homeland, and the graves of one's ancestors. In short, it lies in the annihilation of accountability to our ancestors and peers, in the loss of the conscientiousness which forms the basis of the personal dignity which prevents us all from falling face down in the mud before our fellow countrymen, own collective, and, finally, before our country.

The absence of these moral anchors produces the mentality of a legionary, a time-server, a parasite, and a rolling stone who acknowledges the authority of no one: neither the authority of a parent, nor the authority of the collective, nor the authority of the motherland. And what has the motherland got to do with anything, when you are lured further and further away from the graves of your ancestors by the promise of easy money—in short, by the ruble, the freely convertible ruble?

We have laid bare all our ills, and now the time has come to move on to constructive decisions. I have several proposals to make. We really cannot resolve our very serious national problems without creating a state formation along the lines of the People's Commissariat for Nationalities, which existed up until the war. Because if that kind of body was needed before the war, it is certainly needed now.

Naturally, we must do everything possible to ensure that the language of the indigenous nationality is the state language. It is sad that we have reached the point where the Ukrainian language, for example, has to be defended in the Ukraine. But, as that is the case, it must be done, and it seems to me that the draft law on languages in the Ukraine which has been published is the best possible option. We have worded it as follows: Ukrainian is to be considered the state language on the territory of the Ukraine. The development of the languages spoken by all nations and nationalities living in the Ukraine is to be promoted [spospeshestvovat] at the same state level. Russian is to be considered the language of interethnic communication.

I fully support the party platform on the national question. But from my own experience, albeit very modest, I will say that, if Russian is given as the second state language alongside the state language of the indigenous nation, this is going to give rise to different interpretations, to put it mildly.

Because the formula "language of interethnic communication" also essentially means the statewide language. But harping on the word "statewide" could cause confusion. Perhaps it could simply read: the language of interethnic communication of the USSR?

I find myself in a cauldron of passions surrounding the language problem, to the extent that even the term itself can sometimes fuel the situation.

But in general I would like once again to thank destiny for the fact that I am here at last at the plenum which we were so looking forward to. And let us cherish the lofty values that we have acquired over the last 70 years and that we can be proud of. So that there is not a situation in our country whereby people say, as the people of Odessa sometimes do: Weren't you sitting in the trenches at Stalingrad while blood was being shed at Malaya Z emlya? We grieve equally for those who died at Stalingrad and those who died at Malaya Zemlya. We must cherish what we have acquired along such a hard road and remember that it is no good trying to grab all the blanket for yourself before the eyes of the educated world, when even our friends abroad are saying: Stop it,

boys, you're not so bad. After all, if we do not respect ourselves, who is going to respect us?

S.K. Grossu, first secretary of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee, mounted the rostrum.

Repeated mention has been made of the sources of the surge of radicalist views on the nationalities question, he said. Today, analyzing them again, we are trying to make a deeper assessment of the negative influences on interethnic relations, the crisis in the economy, the inattention toward social needs, and the ignoring of national interests and, most importantly, we are trying to find creative potential whose implementation will lay the foundation for harmonizing interethnic relations in the future.

In order to resolve this task and get rid of the errors of the past, we need a radically renewed nationalities policy according with the demands and the spirit of our perestroyka. We think that the CPSU platform that is being examined at the plenum is perfectly capable of serving as the basis for such a policy. The only pity is that its elaboration was unjustifiably protracted.

Our proposals and remarks regarding the platform have been sent to the CPSU Central Committee and published in the materials distributed to the participants in this plenum. In formulating them we proceeded from the real situation in our republic, from the conditions that had led to the exacerbation of interethnic relations in the republic. And although working people are working very hard to fulfill the plans for the year, the situation continues to remain complex. There are extremist attacks and nationalist, chauvinist manifestations of an anti-Russian and anti-Moldavian character. Certain leaders of unsponsored movements and associations are attempting to exploit democratization and glasnost in order to affirm egoistic and group interests, are proclaiming antisocialist slogans, are pushing people onto the illegal path of anarchy and disorder, and are calling for the creation of alternative power structures.

Tension sharpened particularly on the threshold of the 13th Moldavian Supreme Soviet session, which was convened to examine laws on languages. Rallies became more frequent at this time, their scale expanded considerably, and politically motivated strikes flared up in a number of major cities. Ultimatums and illegal demands began to be submitted to the government and ethnic confrontations between people began to deepen and expand. The Central Committee of the republic's Communist Party reacted to all this most directly. Direct contacts were established with people in labor collectives and at rallies and meetings were held with the leaders of informal organizations and strike committees. An appeal to Communists, workers, and engineering and technical personnel at the striking enterprises was adopted. Meetings were held in primary party organizations and sessions of local soviets and citizens' meetings took place. But the outbursts of ethnically motivated negative emotions are not only a consequence of the adoption of laws on language, which, in declaring Moldavian to be the state language and Russian to be the language of interethnic communication on the republic's territory, in no way discriminate against people of other nationalities. We entirely support the concept set out in the report of giving the Russian language a status of statewide significance.

However, the sources and prime causes of these outbursts lie considerably deeper. They lie in the consequences of the arbitrariness and lawlessness of the times of Stalinism, in the deformation of national development during the period of stagnation, and in economic difficulties and other highly acute social questions.

The republic's party organization, the speaker went on, also feels serious concern at the fact that all kinds of extremist emissaries are shamelessly strolling around the whole country, putting forward anti-Soviet, antisocialist slogans and calling for strikes as a "curative measure" in conditions of perestroyka and for the overthrow of the existing system. However, they are not meeting with a proper rebuff. This political hysteria is gaining ever-increasing scope, and we are surrendering one position after another to it. As for state law enforcement organs, as yet they are standing on the sidelines of these acute events.

In his speech the first secretary of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee dwelt particularly on the problem of strikes, which have not only done appreciable damage to the economy, wrecked contractual pledges, and led to the loss of material assets but also still further destabilized the sociopolitical situation in the republic. In this connection the speaker deems it acutely necessary to place before the USSR Supreme Soviet the question of expediting the adoption of a legislative act regulating such forms of protest. The republic's leaders have made a serious omission in the prevailing situation, the speaker continued. The Central Committee Bureau, the Moldavian Supreme Soviet Presidium and Council of Ministers, and I personally as first secretary of the Central Committee have indeed failed to ensure the implementation of the planned measures to mobilize the efforts of all healthy forces in the republic to stabilize the sociopolitical situation. There is no proper exactingness toward the Communist leaders of party, soviet, state, and economic organs and social organizations. The party committees and primary party organizations of the striking enterprises are displaying impermissible confusion and sometimes an inability to solve the problems which arise by political methods. The Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau has examined the sociopolitical situation and the reasons that led to the strikes in a number of the republic's enterprises. Measures have been taken to stabilize the situation and the main attention is being paid to the expansion of sociocultural problems. A comprehensive state program to ensure the functioning of languages on the Moldavian SSR's territory has been elaborated.

A commission on the formation of an autonomous entity [avtonomiya] for the Gagauz ethnic group has been

created and is operating. Schools offering tuition in the native language have been opened in Ukrainian and Bulgarian villages. A special plenum of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee is in preparation. Thanks to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's personal contacts with representatives of the strike committee, to the thorough work of the USSR Supreme Soviet commission in labor collectives, and to other measures, the workers and engineering and technical personnel of many enterprises, displaying the wisdom and understanding of the situation characteristic of the working class, have suspended the strike and decided to work intensively and highly productively to stabilize our economy as swiftly as possible. Work continues with the labor collectives of the enterprises that are still on strike.

The growth in the scale and complexity of the transformations that are now under way and the acuteness of the problem of interethnic relations, the speaker stressed, oblige us to take a closer look at the activity of the CPSU Central Committee as our party's leading cell. We cannot always perceive a clear Central Committee line on many questions or profound study of them. Sometimes you sense uncertainty and a temporizing position in the speeches of Central Committee leaders.

Communists want to see in practice the results of the Central Committee's activity in overcoming negative features of perestroyka, working out the foundations of ways of achieving consolidation not only on questions of interethnic relations, but also in ensuring our party's integrity, vitality, and renewal. Today the interests of the party and the maintenance of its prestige and guiding [napravlyayushchiy] role require that the CPSU leadership take a considerably deeper look into anomalies that have accumulated and are regularly reproduced, initiate specific action to strengthen the party, and prevent it turning into an ordinary social organization, resolutely resisting those unofficial formations which are trying to create political instability in the country, permit blatant attacks on the party, and ascribe all failings to its cadres. We support the provisions in the report on tasking a Central Committee secretary to look into aspects of interethnic relations.

We have long viewed national problems outside the system of socioeconomic relations. The 1977 USSR Constitution enshrined in legislation the concept of the country's economy as a single national economic complex. Stress in this respect was laid mainly on concentrating the lion's share of functions in running the economy at the center in the shape of union departments rather than on the economic interdependence of the components of the national economy and the processes taking place in it.

It is now possible to hear many different proposals about a new organization of socioeconomic relations and the makeup of our state union as a whole. Unfortunately, people often talk about giving republics an independent status and sovereignty which would essentially lead to the collapse of the union, would undoubtedly be a great setback for the country, and would lead to irreparable material and moral losses. I will state unambiguously that the Moldavian republic party organization does not support such arguments. It fully agrees with the CPSU platform, in which the main idea of the Soviet federation is expressed in the generally accepted formula: Without a strong union there are no strong republics, without strong republics there is no strong union; this means that our strength lies in unity, and we should conduct a resolute political, economic, and parliamentary struggle to that end.

Reporting on the concept of regional self-management and self-financing worked out in Moldavia, the speaker went on to say that Moldavian Communists see their main task as being to normalize the sociopolitical situation in the region, to make interethnic relations in their home republic harmonious, to consolidate healthy forces, and to gear them to the deepening of perestroyka processes and the resolution of socioeconomic problems.

The floor passed to V.I. Vyalyas, first secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee.

Quite a lot of time has already passed since the echo of the first ethnic disruption reverberated around the country, he said, but unfortunately many conflicts have been left essentially unresolved. What is worse, they are sometimes even exacerbating. The natural question is: Are we trying to resolve them in the right way? Neither calls for abstract friendship when feelings are already running high, nor threats, nor even the use of force—as we have repeatedly seen for ourselves—produce the desired result. We know that we need above all an accurate diagnosis.

Unfortunately, we have often continued to tackle more the consequences, whereas the deep-seated causes of conflicts have continued and still continue to exist undisturbed. I am profoundly convinced that our plenum should fundamentally change the party's nationalities policy on the basis of Leninist principles. The peoples expect clear answers to the fundamental questions about the new content of the federation, the practical value [prakticheskoye nasyshcheniye] of the republic's sovereignty, and the Leninist content in the self-determination of nations. The strengthening of our union and the fate of perestroyka depend on this above all.

At the plenum we cannot restrict ourselves to half-hearted semi-restructuring decisions and take them into the Second Congress of the Soviets, since the party's authority would then be irreparably damaged and real events would pass us by. Latterly, for a number of reasons, processes in the Soviet Baltic republics have become an argument sometimes in favor of perestroyka but often against it.

What is actually happening in our republic, specifically in Estonia? I will be blunt: What is happening in Estonia was largely preprogrammed by the well-known events of 50 years ago. That is why full historical truth must be restored without fail. Then we will be able to explain to

our people the seriousness of certain social and demographic deformations, departmental diktat, and the lag behind neighboring countries' living standards. Glasnost and democracy are questions often raised in our republic in a nationalities context too. We should bear this in mind.

The radical changes in nationalities policy have invariably highlighted radical positions—both nationalist and chauvinist. Despite their seeming opposition, both extremes are in surprising solidarity when it comes to their conservatism and fierce attacks on Estonian Communist Party Central Committee policy. And, if there is any difference between them, it is that nationalist conservatism makes no secret of the fact that it is prepared to take the republic back 50 years by returning it to the bourgeois system. While chauvinism, hiding behind pseudorevolutionary phraseology, is not averse to taking us back 40 years, to a Stalinist type of barrack socialism.

The biggest mistake today is to see the danger only on one flank and to combat it from positions at the other extreme. We are convinced that the Estonian Communist Party, relying on society's healthy political core and having its own action program, is capable of neutralizing extremism, providing constructive leadership for perestroyka, and continuing the radical renewal of our life. But on one condition—that the people are well aware that perestroyka began in Moscow, was begun by the party, and can only be successfully continued at local level with the support of the party Central Committee.

From the very outset the Estonian people have ardently welcomed perestroyka, seeing it as a real opportunity to improve their lives and bring about national rebirth. I would like to state quite definitely—and this was shown by our recent party plenum—that we see our further progress only in close consolidation with perestroyka forces throughout the country. A sovereign Estonia in a renewed federation of Soviet peoples—that is our goal.

We share the CPSU Central Committee's concern expressed in the statement on the situation in the Baltic, the actions of certain separatist forces there, and the destabilization of the political situation. But, since we are talking about party trust, it would probably be better if we, the leaders of the Baltic republics, had taken part in compiling this document.

And when this is followed by a certain wave in the central press and on the TV creating a negative stereotype of Estonia, this can only polarize attitudes still further. We have a proverb: "People's own eyes are king." People should always visit, look around, understand, sympathize, and sometimes even have the patience to listen to what someone else is saying.

The recent meeting at the CPSU Central Committee between the leaders of the three Baltic republics and M.S. Gorbachev was constructive and trusting in just this way. We found an understanding of our problems and actions, frankly stated our positions, and listened to fair criticism of our shortcomings and failings. Discussions in our party home should always be comradely and principled in this fashion. Threats, irritation, and mistrust are culled from yesterday's arsenal. In order to further build a rule-of-law state we can in no way avoid the most important question of the role of nations in Soviet society's life. For the first time in many decades we have started talking openly about the burning problems of interethnic relations, and so many concealed problems have come to light that, instead of solving them, some people would like to slam the door shut again and return to the former "idyll" of outward well-being. But there is no turning back any more. The fundamental restructuring of national relations is the only possible way toward mutual respect and mutual understanding among the peoples. This is clearly and plainly stated in the Central Committee platform.

We must build the kind of union that no one would ever dream of leaving. Then there would be no question of separatism. It is our common duty to make a country in which all the peoples—big and small—have a good life and in which each people has a secure home, a comfortable life, and an orderly system, which that people would itself safeguard, as the rightful master. That is why are advocating the sovereignty of the republic and cannot imagine the future without it.

We must also think about those seemingly ordinary things. If the USSR is sometimes portrayed in the old-fashioned way as a common home, in which each people has its own little room or corner, it is actually an unattractive image of communal life. Our new Soviet home must be erected on a new foundation, with very large windows, open to all.

The nation is the fundamental form of mankind's existence, with its roots in the distant past and foreseeable future, and ethnic culture, which has taken centuries to shape, absorbing the experience of generations, is the foundation of general human values. It is the nations and peoples, not the amorphous human mass, that are the entities of history. The destruction of their integrity leads inevitably to the decline of morality, to the crippling of culture, neglect of the everyday environment, ecological anomalies, and, finally, to stagnation.

Hence the need for a differentiated approach to each nation and recognition of the many forms of development. As a result of the prolonged extensive development of the country's economy enormous masses of people have been torn away from their birthplaces. This was largely a senseless and destructive process that continues sometimes even now.

As a result we have deserted villages and enormous, overpopulated cities. Around 60 million people have ended up outside their national republics, not to mention being separated from their birthplaces, which was bound to cause some tension. In many regions of the country the critical level of migration, beyond which an

undesirable destabilization of the traditional way of life occurs, has been significantly exceeded.

In the space of one generation the proportion of Estonians in our republic has dropped from 92 to 60 percent and is continuing to fall. Can the nation remain indifferent to these processes, one asks oneself? How can one not share its anxiety for the future?

At the moment, he went on, our main efforts are focused on the economy, on the switching to republican economic accountability and on establishing the new management mechanism. He gave an account of the preparations for this important step.

For the economic accountability mechanism to operate effectively, the speaker said, our relations with union organs must be placed on a clear footing from the outset in all that relates to the republic's property, the formation of its budget, contract arrangements with the center, and the transfer of the entire economic complex to republican control. It might appear that it has all been discussed in committees and commissions and the basic USSR Supreme Soviet decision has been taken, but, in some offices the whole discussion is having to start again. And time is passing. Of course, in the central organs some leaders are vey sympathetic, and I want to say that this kind of sympathy should be universal. The concept of our economic accountability is very radical, but we are convinced that its common principles are bound to be radical for the other regions of the country as well.

Economic independence, the speaker continued, is now the only alternative for Estonia. The political background is too serious for us to be standing on ceremony. Perestroyka needs, above all, positive advances in the economy, and as soon as possible.

People in our republic support the democratic thrust of the CPSU platform and its line of developing the sovereignty of the national republics. But let us very careful and ensure that there is not a single milligram of repetition of past mistakes in this ultra-important document.

I believe, the speaker said in conclusion, that the Estonian Communist Party theses on the present plenum will be a modest contribution to this. They were widely discussed in party organizations and have been clarified and amplified. The document expresses the will of the Estonian people, who see the republic in the future as a sovereign republic in a new federation of Soviet peoples.

Today, Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee First Secretary S.A. Niyazov said, we had the enormous pleasure of listening to M.S. Gorbachev's report, in which he set out in a clear and principled way the party's stance on many acute issues that have arisen in our society. I run the risk of repeating myself when I say that I believe that one must note again the enormous responsibility this plenum and all its participants have to elaborate correct decisions.

The draft platform on the nationalities policy in present-day conditions is a document that could form the basis of the unification of all progressive forces for the just solution of the problem of harmonizing interethnic relations. As the basis, as a starting point and guide, it is indeed a platform. It will support one in the elaboration of the nationalities poolicy strategy and tactics.

Like previous speakers, I support the proposal on adopting the CPSU Central Committee draft, together with the additions, as a basis. The draft sets out for the first time and elaborates pretty fully the principles of perestroyka and principles for imbuing with new substance a Soviet federation that is of fundamental significance for the future of the USSR and of the republics in the USSR.

The question of the USSR's future, of the strengthening of the voluntary union of Soviet peoples and intensification of their international cohesion is one of the most fundamental questions of the party's nationalities policy. We Communists are responsible for the future of socialism, which is inseparable now from the success of perestroyka. Today these words are a warning issuing from the very lips of history. It poses the question point-blank—the events of recent months in the national arena, are they to go on or not; and our federation, our union, is it to continue to exist or not? In a number of places at the moment the growth of national self-awareness has become a factor that divides peoples instead of helping to bring them together.

Against the background of our foreign policy and its aim of establishing general human values, the state of affairs in the homeland looks paradoxical, to say the least. The common historical destinies of our peoples, the long years of joint work, and victories and upheavals and the economic potential created through the joint efforts of all the peoples cannot and must not be sacrificed to someone's ambition. I believe it is necessary to state—and this is the position of the Communists and entire population of the Turkmen SSR—our loyalty to the 1924 decision to join the USSR and the firm belief that only within the framework of the Soviet federation is it possible to correctly resoplve the political, economic, and national problems that face us.

I think that the CPSU's principled position on this question could be clearly and unambiguously expressed in the decision of this plenum and the party's platform on the nationalities question.

The proposed concept of the expansion of the union republics' sovereignty is based on the clear legal demarcation of their powers in the framework of the Union as well as the transfer of the republics to khozraschet and self-financing.

This is the only correct approach. We regard the potential of khozraschet with optimism and have begun constructing its model. As early as next year around 40 percent of the cost price of finished products made from our raw materials will go into the republic's budget.

Enterprises producing more than 60 percent of our industrial output will be transferred to the control of the republic's Council of Ministers. That figure is 10 percent at present. Relations with union ministries will be formed in a new way.

After supporting the opinion that it is necessary to take into the initial potential of each republic in the transfer to khozraschet, the speaker went on to stress that part of Turkmenistan's national income, transferred into light industry sectors and the intensive processing of oil and gas, is to be found in other republics, including the Baltic republics. This should be taken into account in the transfer to khozraschet, and the interests of one republic should not be harmed to the benefit of another.

There is still a long way to go before Turkmenistan's social level is actually equalized and it is raised to at least the union average. Our people are no less diligent and tenacious than any other and our land does not lack natural resources. Nevertheless, the unbalanced development of industry and the bias in agriculture toward cotton will need a certain amount of time and help if the situation is to be rectified somewhat. That help may take the form of targeted, comprehensive, regional programs. The allocation of those targets and subsidies from the all-union budget are essentially political in character because it affects the vital interests of a considerable section of the region's population. In this connection I would like to suggest that the draft program's proposal for the creation of a support fund for regions which are behind in their economic development and for those which have been affected by natural disaster bears a somewhat formal and, I would say, random character in the context of political tasks. Help in the development of economically backward regions should be real, validated, and effective.

Touching on other aspects of the platform, the speaker noted that they are all aimed at creating the necessary conditions for the revival on a new basis of the national culture of the language and traditions of our country's peoples. The correct combination of the national and international and of general human values and respect for individual rights are a good basis for the harmonization of relations among people and among peoples. Our republic has still not adopted and is not discussing a draft law on the national language's status as the state language. This is not because our language has not been harmed but because we believe that stages should not be missed out. The republic today is not ready to adopt official language status, even though people have been coming from a number of regions trying to persuade our experts and intelligentsia to do so immediately. We have decided to adopt a state program for the development of the usage of the Turkmen language and the languages of all the peoples inhabiting our republic. And subsequently, after a certain preparation, we too will adopt a state language status. Practice shows that in those republics which have adopted this status interethnic questions have arisen. Therefore, S.A. Niyazov went on, it is necessary to be prepared so as not infringe any nation's interests. This question cannot be resolved by slogans alone now. The adoption of Russian as the country's common state language, on the other hand, would ease the situation in all republics.

The nationalities question is part of mankind's international experience. The future of our country and indeed of the world as a whole favors integration and internationalization in which the equality of the peoples is truly sovereign. There is also progress in the general human understanding of this word. The draft platform also has other vulnerable points leading not to the resolution of contradictions but to their greater deepening. I have in mind the question of citizenship and its dual function. The Soviet Union unites working people of all nations and defends the interests of working people without national distinction, as V.I. Lenin said. Is it so important to equip the citizen of the USSR with dual status—union and republic? Are we not creating artificial problems here? And how will we defend the interests of our Soviet working people if we divide them into national compartments?

During the current reports and elections it is clear how much the exactingness of the grass roots toward leaders for the results of their work is increasing. For the further consolidation of party ranks and the renewal of the activity of all party links it is necessary to clearly set apart and if necessary expel from the CPSU's ranks those who have taken nationalist positions or who by their passivity and lack of principle weaken the unity of party ranks.

We see our task now in ensuring that every Communist in the republic is an active champion of the ideas of internationalism and helps to unite the nations and ethnic groups living here. We are firmly convinced that without interethnic accord and the friendship of the peoples there will be no effective progress along the path of renewing socialism and really improving people's lives.

I am deeply convinced, D.G. Zavgayev, first secretary of the Chechen-Ingush party obkom, noted, that the main thing lacking from our work of improving interethnic relations is a fruitful, realistic scientific concept which, based on the Leninist understanding of the problem, would accumulate current, practical experience. The approaches to this are now defined in the CPSU platform. Nevertheless, one senses that in fact here we are still proceeding by trial and error: Either we completely discard what has been achieved in this sphere or, conversely, we idolize it.

The CPSU report is conceptual and provides an opportunity for serious thought. The discussion of the CPSU platform in the country made it possible to heed the problems of the regions more sensitively and at the same time to understand more subtly the dialectics of the general and the particular in these questions. In addition to stepping up daily work, for example, we and our neighbors are planning to discuss a series of our region's

interethnic problems. I think that after meeting with workers, peasants, intelligentsia, the party and soviet aktiv, and the clergy we will be able to resolve many questions, including social, everyday, linguistic, and others, which are still so acute today. I believe in general that we are lax in our conduct of intraregional and interregional dialogue. Furthermore, contact between regions is most often based on economic needs and not on people. I believe that the direction here should be reversed—from people to the economy. The economic ideas of some republics are attractive to us primarily because they give an opportunity for autonomy, our own type of autonomy, to seriously consider ways of developing further and not simply to follow the stereotypes formed for the region. In fact we are now facing the need to create an economic model for the republic and its present and future situation. The Union is formed from its parts, and when the structure of each of them is carefully studied and inscribed into the regional and, at the same time, all-union context, relations between the republic and the center and accordingly interethnic relations will be more harmonious.

We are now working on the creation of a model for the republic's socioeconomic development and this will be an important step on the path of improving interethnic relations too.

Today the country is conducting a lively discussion of the ideas of regional economic accountability. Moreover, these ideas are being actively implemented. It is possible to single out three "floors" in this complex process: the economic, political, and sociopsychological. While we can to some extent "count up" and predict economic and political results, we are forecasting sociopsychological consequences inadequately and controlling them only feebly. Yet they include people's feelings and aspirations and social state. Regional economic accountability inevitably presupposes fundamentally new forms of interaction between regions, direct interaction and not only interaction through the center. And that dictates the need for the scientific elaboration of sociopsychological questions of interaction between the regions.

There has been much criticism of the leadership of interethnic relations recently, including at the Congress of People's Deputies. An analysis of the situation and constructive proposals leading to ways out of impasses—apparent impasses, I should stress—are what is important now.

People who create impasses in this delicate sphere are blatantly exploiting the negative burden of the past and impeding perestroyka. There should be less black and white here and, conversely, a constant quest for the spectrum of interaction. But, in developing the ideals of democracy in society, we must firmly defend the fundamental values of socialism which our society has gained. A normal revolutionary process is under way which requires the defense of the political interests of society and the individual.

But often political adventurists, taking advantage of our indecisiveness, set the tone, a tone which impedes the progress of our relations and social structures, disorients people, and causes a sense of instability. We have consulted with the oblast party organization and we believe that the party must struggle boldly and more persistently for its ideals—there is no other way.

The speaker touched on the complexities in assessing the state of interethnic relations, pointing out that it is not only political but also economic and cadres decisions which have an effect here. The entire complex of socioeconomic factors operating in the country, he noted, is the complex infrastructure of interethnic relations. Incidentally, people in Checheno-Ingushetia do not nurture a grievance against the Kazakh people, individual representatives of whom in fact drove our fellow countrymen out of Novyy Uzen. This is not a question of interethnic relations but of an unbalanced social policy which tears where it is stretched thin. We remember how the fraternal Kazakh people and other peoples helped us in our most onerous exile and at the time these relations were indeed both interethnic and simply human.

In interethnic relations, as in the family, when there are material difficulties and daily life is not organized, conflicts arise. So will we for that reason embark on "interethnic divorce" in the country instead of strengthening the family of Soviet peoples and resolving all the socioeconomic problems which have accumulated?

There is a mass of spiritual and cultural factors which make up national self awareness and we must see and consider them in daily practice rather than sticking labels, as was the case in the past.

On the basic of specific examples the speaker showed the need for a more considered approach toward events in the sphere of interethnic relations.

In tackling some regional and union problems we are starting to make now-familiar mistakes, the chief of which is the attempt to skip the natural stages of a process. That is what happened with the "complete solution of the nationalities question." We are now skipping again, and again several steps. I am thinking here of the decisions taken by a number of republics proclaiming the native language a state language. They are important, but as they have been adopted "at one gulp" without a long-term phased program they are again creating difficulties. It is necessary here to resist pressure from both left and right.

Our republic knows through its own experience all the difficulties of developing one's native language. We are now rectifying this situation. But I often wonder whether we may not impoverish ourselves by this linguistic localization and whether the laws on language adopted in such a categorical form in some places may not complicate proper collaboration among republics. The development of national culture, literature, and education rather than the production of official documents should be a language's prime function, since the latter have never

created a national culture. The real picture in the regions is that the population is multilingual, and the instant granting of state status to one language is bound to separate people from one another. Whereas actual language policy ought to be used to create the opportunity for rapprochement, including via the development of bilingualism.

Scientists have serious work to do in this sphere, since language is the most important medium for a people's self-realization and it is necessary to seek greater cooperation rather than alternatives in this delicate area and to perceive the complex dialectics of bilingualism rather than posing linguistic ultimatums.

Another extremely important problem, the speaker said, is appropriate understanding by the center of the real processes taking place in the republics and autonomous units. And here I would like to highlight a number of features. The competence of some of the people who provide a picture in the supreme party organs of the situation in a given region is doubtful, as is their actual accountability for the information on which the political decisions being made are based.

The Central Committee apparatus' responsibility for providing true and realistic information devoid of exaggeration and misrepresentation is enormous, and it must be increased. Take, for example, our Chechen-Ingush ASSR, a republic with a difficult, dramatic political history. Interethnic relations in it are frequently described as tense. And we do indeed have a lot of difficulties. But the real situation is of a quite different psychological nature, which must be appreciated and taken into account. Namely, the republic's difficult history, which includes the tragic expulsion of peoples, the difficulties that arose after the republic's restoration, and problems of a social nature. I can recall now the events of 1973 in the republic known as the Ingush events. They were caused by people's real social troubles [neblagopoluchiye], and many problems persist unresolved there to this day. This year, the speaker continued, commemorative days remembering those who died during Stalinist exile have been held in the republic. They represent a great cleansing of the people of lies and omissions, they represent the truth, which is always important in interethnic relations.

The second aspect of this is that we sometimes try at local level, through our lack of experience in working in the new conditions, to squeeze the new concept of developing interethnic relations into the old forms and stereotypes of management stemming from the command-administrative system. And thereby unwittingly slow down the center's efforts.

There are various opinions on the prospects for the development of interethnic relations. But I am an optimist. We have only just begun to address this problem in a proper and purposeful way, forsaking our illusions. And this is the first sign that the country will solve the problem.

(The report will be concluded in the next issue).

More 20 Sep Party Plenum Speeches Reported

Ligachev Defends Perestroyka

LD2209072789 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0920 GMT 21 Sep 89

[Report on speech by Yegor Ligachev, Politburo member and Central Committee secretary, at the 20 September session of the CPSU Central Committee plenum on the nationalities issue; from an unattributed "account of the speeches of participants in the CPSU Central Committee plenum at the morning session" on the second day of plenum proceedings]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] The floor is given to Yegor Ligachev, Politburo member, of CPSU Central Committee secretary:

First of all I want to express my satisfaction at the fact that the Central Committee party plenum has adopted the decision, which is of fundamental importance, of convening the 28th party congress and on a modern nationality policy for the party. I believe that the party Central Committee has shown with new force that our party occupies a leading role in society in working out the problems of perestroyka and socialist construction. I think you will agree with me if I say that this is a worthy response to those who, without having constructive proposals, are trying to accuse the party of allegedly not having a program of action. This is the first thing I wanted to say.

Next, as A.Ya. Sukharev reported, the USSR Procuracy has established after careful investigation that there was no "criminal event."

This is a legal term. What does it mean in other words? It is malicious intent, it is slander and provocation.

As a citizen I could of course now take further steps against the slanderers in accordance with the law. But I respect the will of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies, which, as you know, formed its own commission to study the circumstances connected with the activity of the well-known group of investigators. It is relevant to say that it is for this reason that I did not write anywhere in the press. At the same time, the investigators appeared on television, called rallies and even appeared on the stage.

I want to say that I have received many letters and telegrammes expressing comradely support and hopes that I would stand my ground. As you know, words of support were heard at Central Committee plena, at Central Committee conferences and at the first USSR Congress of People's Deputies and in trips around the country. I will not hide the fact that this confidence and comradely solidarity gave me strength, and still does.

I hardly need speak about what I have gone through over these months. The scars, of course, remain. This is probably understandable on a human level, but I asked to speak and I want to say that in the last resort the matter is not about me. The issue is something else.

We Central Committee members must see that defamation of Communists, representatives of the intelligentsia, writers, scholars and leaders both at the centre and in the localities, has become a widespread crime against the individual. That is the issue.

Two investigators publicly spew out streams of slander and demagogy against the party, the Politburo, the Central Committee apparatus and the organs of justice. More than that, they have led into error and deceived thousands of people and their voters. For a long time they succeed in this. Let us say bluntly that such parasitism on glasnost and democracy is by no means an isolated occurrence.

This appears to me to be an exceedingly dangerous political phenomenon. One cannot fail to notice that it is gathering strength and is becoming an effective device for achieving far-reaching aims. What are they but to drive a wedge between party and people, between Communists and party committees, and to compromise principled officials and get their own people into power?

As V.I. Lenin said, political careerists have no firm ideas. They are dishonest people.

Let us take, for example, the corruption case in Uzbekistan. The exposure of those facts began on the initiative of the CPSU Central Committee at the end of 1983 and got under way in earnest after the April 1985 Central Committee plenum. The Politburo instructed a group of Central Committee officials, including me as Central Committee secretary, to concern itself directly with this matter.

We operated by political methods, relying on the Communists of the republic and the labor collectives. Without the Uzbek comrades, who reacted with pain and alarm to all that had happened at that time in their republic, we really could not have done very much. A great deal of the work fell to the lot of hundreds of officials of the KGB and Ministry of Internal Affairs, of the Union Procurator's Office and of other law enforcement bodies.

Notice this: Massive attempts were made to discredit in the eyes of public opinion virtually all the members of the Central Committee group, as well as many of the staff of the law enforcement bodies. I ask this pointed question once again: Why was it precisely at the people who had boldly and uncompromisingly taken up the flight against the bribetakers, precisely at them that the avenging blow was struck? Why was the shadow of suspicion cast precisely on them? Why?

Another point: From the very outset of perestroyka many communists, workers, military men and party functionaries in speeches and in articles drew attention to the need for a respectful attitude to our history and the contribution of whole generations to the construction of communism, to the impermissibility of lowering the role of the working class and the kolkhoz peasantry in the life of society, to the drawing together of the nations through their all-around development, to responsibility for the unity of the party and to the danger of introducing into our life alien ideals and spiritual values.

How many direct and veiled verbal attacks, but always refined ones, there were on those who spoke of this, who wrote about it, who adopted and continue to adopt firm positions and who do not conceal their ideological convictions and do not keep silent. Incidentally, silence, as you know, is also a stand. Indeed, there are such comrades among us.

Let me say without beating around the bush that in the spring of last year I had to speak out clearly against the recarving of the boundaries of two Transcaucasian republics. Incidentally, one has merely had to speak about the party Central Committee's decision adopted in February last year for this literally to exasperate the nationalists; their moves have not slackened off. All this comes from a single well-known corner.

If one calls things by their true names, in particular areas of the country there is a frank struggle for power underway and an acute political struggle whose class roots have been laid very bare. The political struggle is centered around the issue of the ways to develop the country. Some, and they are in the majority, favor moving undeviatingly ahead along the path of perestroyka and revitalizing society and socialist construction. Others favor turning toward capitalism and bourgeois democracy and introducing private ownership into the economy and a multiple party set-up into the political system.

I think you feel the same as I do, frequently visiting collectives where people literally inundate one with questions on when a real rebuff will be given to the antisocialist forces, nationalists, and separatists. After all, they have already managed to bring the people so much trouble!

At their wish, hundreds of completely innocent people have died, there have been thousands of injured and refugees number hundreds of thousands. Many people have simply come to fear for their lives and for their families.

Yesterday, Mikhail Sergeyevich said that we should not be nervous. I believe that this is a very good and timely piece of advice. Displaying composure, one should observe genuinely democratic order in society and strengthen socialist legality. If we pander to nationalists, separatists, and slanderers—and they have already managed to do a great deal—perestroyka will undoubtedly be derailed.

This is what is at issue, I believe.

It is from those who are pushing us toward a capitalist path, from nationalists who would like to demolish the union and those who play "democratic games" with them—it is from these that the main danger to perestroyka looms. It does not emanate from those whom they deliberately label as "conservatives" for their faith in socialism and the people, and for their loyalty to the principles of internationalism. It is high time to discern this and not to equate the two.

You will agree, I think, that the duty of party committees consists in insuring the protection of honest people who are genuine fighters for perestroyka, in speaking out against slanderers and intriguers, using the force of the law and of the public, of course. With those who are really mistaken one should constantly carry on a dialogue and seek to convince them of the rectitude of what we are doing. By all means possible, it is also necessary to develop constructive criticism and to intensify the struggle with bureaucracy. This, one must suppose, is our sacred obligation.

Finally, the last thing: I think I will not be mistaken if I say that at the present time, the eyes of people and their hopes are turned toward the Communist Party. I share the conviction that the renewal of socialism and the uncovering of the huge possibilities that lie in it is only possible with the strengthening of the leading role of the Communist Party. The proposal to limit the functions of our party and the proposal even to deprive it completely of some of them is not new. This proposal is pursuing the end of dismissing Communists from the leadership of society.

It is a matter of strengthening the leading, and not only the coordinating, role of the party above all by way of renewing it, of widely democratising life inside the party, of reinterpreting the forms, means and ways of its practical work, that is, it is a matter of something that has never happened before, and more over, that cannot be given now once and for all.

I think you will agree if I say that a party which is not capable of being renewed and restructured, cannot be a ruling party. This is completely evident. This is why the task of the unity of the party, of the ideological and organizational cohesion of its ranks and the strengthening of the link between the party and the masses comes to the fore of perestroyka. I am convinced that this is now the most important thing, that this is our main concern. Afterall, is it really admissible that groups of communists and even party workers take part in the kindling of interethnic dissension, in assemblages of an anti-Soviet character? At the same time they are doing everything to weaken, to discredit the principle of democratic centralism and even to exclude it completely from the rules [of the party]. The task consists in strengthening discipline in the party and in strictly observing the requirements of the rules. Without this there cannot be a political party, a party of the Leninist type.

It is very important for us to understand why some people believed wholesale accusations against the leaders. This is a fact, a bitter one, but a fact; yes, because there were in real life Rashidovs, Churbanovs, and others, and people are still coming up against instances of extortion. For this reason our task is to step up the struggle against this evil, with this loathesome phenomenon and always to be merciless here.

Of course, behind all problems we must constantly see the person, his daily concerns, see the main thing: more housing, more goods, more chances to live better both materially and spiritually. The question of questions is, after all, food. This is not the problem of some department or other; this is the common concern of both rural and urban areas.

I am certain that if we return their combativeness to all links of the party, and work by democratic methods, we will strengthen the links of the party with the masses, and then certainly will overcome by practical work the social tension in society, and strengthen the prestige and trust in the party.

I am an optimist, as you are. I believe in our common cause, I believe in perestroyka, I believe in communism. I believe that what the party has sketched out, what the people are engaged in is the way out for our country to new socialist, quality advances. We simply need to work more, each and all of us need to work and to ensure real results. In the end, all this is for the interests of our people. [passage omitted]

Yazov on Army Support for Party Policy

PM2109185989 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 22 Sep 89 First Edition p 2

[Speech by Army General D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister, at the CPSU Central Committee September Plenum: "The Army of the Friendship and Brotherhood of the Peoples"; delivered 20 September]

[Text] The report by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the party's draft platform are of tremendous political significance. They comprehensively substantiate and cogently reveal the fundamental principles and aims and the strategy and tactics of our party's contemporary nationalities policy. This policy expresses the will of the Communists and broad masses of the working people, it accords with the vital interests of all Soviet peoples, and it is aimed at the renewal, defense, and consolidation of the Soviet socialist federation.

The Armed Forces support the party's policy. The Communists in the Army and Navy approve of the proposal on convening the next 28th CPSU Congress. Army and Navy party organizations are fully determined to use the preparation for the congress to galvanize all intraparty

life, to rally the Communists, and to strengthen party influence on all aspects of military life and activity.

Our Army is a part of the people. V.I. Lenin and the Bolshevik Party created it as an army of the friendship and brotherhood of the peoples. Internationalism, fused as one with Soviet patriotism, even today determines the spirit of our army and the entire tenor of its life and activity. Representatives of all the Soviet peoples serve in its ranks. As a rule there are 90-95 nationalities in military districts, 40-50 in divisions, and up to 30 in units and on ships.

These statistics are instructive in their own right. But, as you will appreciate, behind them stand all the problems typical of the present stage of national development and interethnic relations in our country. It is impossible not to see that certain negative phenomena which have arisen in a number of republics have started to penetrate into soldiers' barracks and sailors' quarters. This is also manifested in instances of national egoism and conceit on the part of individual servicemen, and ethnically motivated cliquishness. Instances of draft dodging by certain draftees have occurred which are unprecedented and are politically, socially, and morally alien to our system and to the very idea of defending the socialist fatherland. Instances of so-called nonregulation relations are increasingly frequently assuming ethnic overtones.

All this is an echo of the far-from-constructive processes which nationalistic, separatist, and extremist forces have succeeded in launching in a number of the country's regions. These forces are attempting to speculate on the indeed complex and acute ethnic problems. They have been quite successful in exploiting for their own ends the new moral and political atmosphere created by the party in society, and the climate of openness and democratism, in order to satisfy their political ambitions. Not having been duly rebuffed, and not disdaining lies, slander, and the incitement of base passions, they are trying to impose on thousands and thousands of people—and sometimes not unsucessfully—slogans that are full of enmity and hatred for socialism, the party, and the Armed Forces.

An unhealthy atmosphere has taken shape around the military cantonments of a number of military units stationed in the Baltic region, the Transcaucasus, and certain other regions of the country. Demands, accompanied by cynical insults, for the withdrawal of large units and units to the territory of the Russian Federation have become commonplace. Soviet servicemen are being labeled occupiers. The urge to encroach upon their personal dignity and to inflict moral and physical abuse has become systematic in some places. Instances of discrimination in the granting of housing and residence permits for the families of servicemen and in job placement have become widespread. Attempts are being made to restrict or even totally rescind the right of servicemen to elect people to the organs of power or to be elected themselves. All this is accompanied by attempts—including with the aid of local and somtimes certain central mass media—to shape in the public's mind a negative attitude toward the army, toward military service, and toward the military profession itself. Of course, we are not talking about the criticism of shortcomings and negative phenomena which exist in the Army and which need to be extirpated. Such criticism is justifiable and we favor it. I am talking about something else: the overtly prejudiced coverage of the history, life, and activity of the Armed Forces, and the distortion of their place and role in society, in perestroyka.

All this offends those who have dedicated their life to military service, who honorably discharge their difficult military duty; and it evokes legitimate indignation in them. And we have no right to underestimate the uneasiness of people who bear arms. In some places passions are very seriously inflamed. Many officers and ensigns serving, for example, in Lithuania are stating bluntly that the intolerable situation which has been created on the grounds of the deliberate exacerbation of interethnic relations is perturbing them today far more even than their poorly organized day-to-day existence and the lack of housing—and, as we know, in certain units located in this republic more than half the families have no housing.

This is acquiring a particular, sociopolitical coloration as a result of the fact that local party, soviet, and law-enforcement organs are sometimes adopting the position of detached observers in respect of negative phenomena and facts. In a number of areas communication between these organs and the commanders, political organs, and party organizations of troop units and large units is being weakened and even curtailed.

Recently there have been increasingly overt calls for our Army to be divided up into national compartments, ultimatum-type demands for the creation of national troop formations and for military service by individuals of the indigenous nationality exclusively on the territories of their own republics. These calls are being made by the leaders of the people's fronts of Latvia, Estonia, and Georgia, Lithuania's "Sajudis," and a number of other movements. Indeed, yesterday Comrade Gumbaridze also submitted such a proposal. Yet at the same time he said that the representatives of many nationalities live on the territory of Georgia. Does this mean that it is necessary to create many armies also, does it mean that every aul [Caucasian mountain village] must have its own army?

I would like to recall that at the dawning of Soviet power, when substantiating the need for the unity of the Soviet republics for defense purposes, V.I. Lenin emphasized the vital importance of the cohesion of all military forces in the mighty international Red Army. "Not a single Soviet republic taken individually," he said, "can regard itself as secure against economic exhaustion and military devastation." As before, these Leninist tenets retain their topicality today too.

The conclusion drawn by the 19th All-Union Party Conference that imperialist sources of aggression and

war have not disappeared and that guarantees of the irreversibility of the incipient positive processes have not taken shape is based on a profound analysis and critical assessment of the contemporary scene and trends. The desire of the U.S. military-political leadership to retain military strength as the chief instrument of U.S. foreign policy is abundantly clear from the documents of the U.S. Congress and the Pentagon concerning the fiscal 1990-91 military budget and the military building programs for the 1990-94 fiscal years. The utterances of U.S. President G. Bush, FRG Chancellor H. Kohl, and certain NATO military leaders testify to the North Atlantic bloc's adherence to the deterrence strategy, a deterrence addressed primarily to the Soviet Union and its allies.

The internationalization of the life and activities of the Armed Forces of the military-political bloc opposing us is enhancing their power. The question arises: For what, with what aim is this being done? For we have stated officially that we will never start a war and will not be the first to use nuclear weapons. Nevertheless, intensive war preparations are under way in the West. We fully support the party line of deepening the process of perestroyka, of detente and disarmament. At the same time we do not have the right to forget 1941. We cannot allow it to be repeated.

All this obligates us to possess not only a sufficient but also an unconditionally reliable defense and combat-ready armed forces both for our country and the entire Warsaw Pact. It is not to be doubted that a rule-of-law state must possess a rule-of-law army. Clearly, in the interests of maintaining our army as an international force we should legislatively determine each republic's contribution to defense building in line with its potentials. In this connection I propose that point five of the section "How To Restructure the Soviet Federation and Make It a Full-Blooded Federation" be amplified and brought into line with article 31 of our present USSR Constitution, which says: "The defense of the Soviet fatherland is among the state's most important functions and is the affair of the entire people." It is necessary to display effective concern for the study of the Russian language in the union republics. It is the language of interethnic communication in our country. In the Army and the Navy all instruction and education is conducted only in this language, and ignorance or poor knowledge of it creates considerable difficulties in mastering weaponry and equipment, the operational coordination of subunits, and the maintenance of the requisite level of combat readiness. Meanwhile, last year the number of draftees without Russian in practical terms exceeded 125,000 men. This is 12 times as many as 20 years ago. An alarming trend.

The successful realization of the international principle in defense building and in the development and training of the Armed Forces depends directly on the close interaction of Army and Navy command and political organs with local party and soviet organs, and with the commissions and working groups on interethnic relations established under them. Above all else this relates to the solution of the tasks of replenishing the officer corps with ethnic cadres, training young people for military service, and the military-patriotic education of the people. Life demands the precise definition in the law on defense now under elaboration of our Army's special status, of the ensuring of its social protection as a Union institution at state level. An unambiguous answer must be given to the question of the Army's function: its involvement in the solution of internal tasks and problems must be regulated.

In conclusion, I wish to emphasize that, for all the acuteness, complexity, and contradictoriness of the nationalities question, its solution lies along the path of uniting the efforts of all the peoples of our country in the revolutionary renewal and defense of Soviet society.

Plenum Resolution on Investigation of Ligachev

LD2109165789 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1549 GMT 21 Sep 89

["The Decision of the CPSU Central Committee Plenum on the Report of USSR Procurator General Concerning the Examination of the Statement of Ligachev, Member of the Politburo and Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee."—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 21 Sep (TASS)—The decision of the CPSU Central Committee plenum, which ended on Wednesday [20 September], has been circulated here today. It says:

1. The Central Committee plenum takes into consideration the report of USSR Procurator General Aleksandr Sukharev on the examination of the statement of Yegor Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, addressed to the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Procuracy. The investigation of the claims of taking bribes brought against Yegor Ligachev by the investigators Telman Gdlyan and Nikolay Ivanov, which was carried out according to the law by the USSR Procuracy, has shown their complete groundlessness. According to the conclusion of the USSR Procuracy it is a question of nonoccurrence of the event itself.

2. The Central Committee plenum instructs the Moscow City CPSU Committee to examine the question of party responsibility of Telman Gdlyan and Nikolay Ivanov in keeping with the conclusions of the USSR Procuracy.

Biographies of New Central Committee Secretaries

Andrey Girenko

LD2109152189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1305 GMT Sep 89

[Text] Moscow, 21 Sep (TASS)—Andrey Girenko, 53-year-old first secretary of the Crimean oblast committee

[obkom] of the Ukraine Communist Party, was elected secretary of the party Central Committee at the CPSU Central Committee Plenum which ended on Wednesday.

Andrey Girenko is a Ukrainian, he was born in Krivoy Rog, industrial center of the Ukraine, and studied at the local ore-mining institute. After he completed studies he worked as a team leader and mechanic at a mine and was head of the Komsomol organization of the enterprise.

Afterwards, for 10 years he led the city, the oblast and then the central committees of the Ukrainian Komsomol. After this he was elected first secretary of the Kherson and then Crimean obkoms of the Ukraine Communist Party.

Andrey Girenko has been a candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee since 1986 and at the plenum, which ended yesterday, he was transferred into the membership of the Central Committee. He is a USSR people's deputy.

Yuriy Manayenkov

LD2109164989 Moscow TASS in English 1521 GMT 21 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 21 TASS—Yuriy Manayenkov, head of the Lipetsk Regional Party Organisation, Central Russia, was elected secretary of the CPSU Central Committee at the Central Committee plenary meeting on Wednesday.

Manayenkov, Russian, was born in 1936. He graduated from an agricultural institute and the Correspondence Party School at the CPSU Central Committee. At first a kolkhoz farmer in the Tambov region, Manayenkov then worked for a regional newspaper in 1958. He joined the party in 1960.

In 1962 Manayenkov went over to party work, becoming an instructor of a regional party committee. Then he headed the party organisation of a state farm and was editor of a regional newspaper. After returning to the regional committee, he served as a secretary, second and first secretaries of the CPSU regional committee. From 1973 Manayenkov is a department head, secretary and the second secretary of the Tambov Regional Committee. In 1984 he was elected first secretary of the Lipetsk Regional Party Committee. Yuriy Manayenkov is a people's deputy of the USSR.

Yegor Stroyev

LD2109164489 Moscow TASS in English 1534 GMT 21 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 21 TASS—Yegor Stroyev, 52, first secretary of the Orel Regional Party Committee, Central Russia, was one of the four new Central Committee secretaries, elected at the plenary meeting on Wednesday.

Stroyev, Russian, graduated from an agricultural institute and the Higher Party School at the CPSU Central Committee. He started work in 1955 as a kolkhoz farmer. After receiving education he was an agronomist, a section chief and the secretary of the kolkhoz part bureau. He is a party member since 1958.

From 1963 Stroyev has been holding various party and government posts: Secretary, second secretary of the party regional committee, chairman of the executive committee of a regional council. In 1973 he becomes a secretary of the Orel Party Regional committee and first secretary in 1985. From 1986 he is a member of the CPSU Central Committee, a people's deputy of the USSR.

Gumer Usmanov

LD2109165489 Moscow TASS in English 1537 GMT 21 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 21 TASS—Gumer Usmanov, first secretary of the Tatar Regional Party Committee, was elected secretary of the CPSU Central Committee at the plenary meeting of the Central Committee on Wednesday [20 September].

Usmanov, Tatar, is 57 years old. He joined the party in 1953 and has higher agricultural education. Usmanov started working as a teacher at an agricultural mechanisation school and from 1953 was on Komsomol, management and party work. He rose from the first secretary of a Komsomol regional committee to the first secretary of a party regional committee. From 1966 he was chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Tatar Autonomous Republic, from 1982 first secretary of the Tatar Party Regional Committee. Usmanov was elected member of the CPSU Central Committee in 1986. He is also a people's deputy of the USSR and a deputy of the republic's Supreme Soviet.

Supreme Soviet Deputies Begin Registering

LD2209103989 Moscow World Service in English 1000 GMT 22 Sep 89

[Excerpt] Registration has begun in the Kremlin of Deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet who are arriving for the next session of parliament. [passage omitted]

Gorbachev Chairs Supreme Soviet Presidium Session

LD2109164389 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1553 GMT 21 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow, 21 Sep (TASS)—Today in the Kremlin under the chairmanship of Mikhail Gorbachev, USSR Supreme Soviet chairman, a sitting of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium took place.

The sitting discussed questions connected with holding the second session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, which is opening on 25 September. The agenda and order of the session's work have been approved.

In connection with the presentation by the USSR Government of drafts of the USSR state plan of economic

and social development and the USSR state budget for 1990, on which Yuriy Maslyukov spoke, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decided to hand over these drafts, and also hand over the report on the fulfillment of the budget for 1988, for examination by the USSR Supreme Soviet. The permanent commissions of the chambers and the committees of the USSR Supreme Soviet have been charged with giving these drafts a preliminary examination and presenting their conclusions to the Supreme Soviet.

According to the report of Viktor Kucherenko, chairman of the Soviet of the Union Commission on Planning and Budget and Finance the order of work of the committees of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the permanent commissions of the chambers for a preliminary study of the plan and budget for 1990 has been approved.

After listening to the report by Anatoliy Lukyanov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, the Presidium gave the committees of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the commissions of its chambers the task of making a preliminary examination of the draft laws of the USSR on property in the USSR, on a single tax system for the USSR, on socialist enterprises, on the introduction of amendments and supplements to the USSR law "On Cooperatives," and the draft basis of legislation of the USSR and the union republics on land, and on leasing and lease relationships in the USSR, which have been submitted by the USSR Council of Ministers.

The question of priority measures to improve the legislation of the USSR in the field of relations between nationalities in connection with the decisions of the USSR Congress of Peoples Deputies and the September 1989 plenum of the CPSU Central Committee was discussed.

The Presidium examined the question of improving the work of the press in reporting the activity of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies, USSR Supreme Soviet, its bodies, the people's deputies in the center and in the localities. To this end, it was decided to transform the magazine of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium SOVETY NARODNYKH DEPUTATOV [SOVIETS OF PEOPLE'S DEPUTIES] into a social, political, news and discussion journal, NARODNYY DEPUTAT [PEOPLE'S DEPUTY] published by the USSR Supreme Soviet. Yevgeniy Primakov was confirmed as the chairman of the editorial council of the magazine.

With the aim of preaching and developing the Leninist ideas of a Soviet Federation, it was deemed expedient to publish a weekly SOYUZ [UNION] beginning January 1990, a supplement to the paper IZVESTIYA SOVETOV NARODNYKH DEPUTATOV SSSR [NEWS OF THE USSR SOVIETS OF PEOPLE'S DEPUTIES]

Several other questions of state life were examined at the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Vologzhin Assesses CPSU Plenum

LD2109161889 Moscow TASS in English 1602 GMT 21 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 21 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

The results of the recent plenum of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee which ended on Wednesday were discussed in Soviet parliament today. Inter-ethnic relations have become one of the central issues of Soviet perestroika and affect the whole set of radical reforms in the USSR.

USSR people's deputies link the plenum's results with big and rseponsible work which they will have to do at the forthcoming session of the USSR Supreme Soviet which opens on September 25. It will consider a package of socio-economic bills which envisage a fundamental change in production relations. All this is closely connected with inter-ethnic relations.

"For the first time in many years, the Communist Party has analysed real processes in the nationalities issue and has worked out a concrete platform of developing inter-ethnic relations in the Soviet Union," Valentin Vologzhin, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Economic Reform, told TASS. Vologzhin was present at the recent Communist Party plenum. "The current platform has nothing to do with the vague and general formula of the recent past, it offers a concrete programme of actions," he said. Vologzhin believes that the plenum's results will become one of the key elements of restructuring.

He pointed out that the plenum had paid great attention to the question of property. This is a matter of [words indistinct] (?having) economic independence of Soviet republics, he said.

"Our committee is now studying different approaches to the elaboration of a USSR property law. This should enable the forthcoming session to pass this legislative act which will become central for a new stage of Soviet economic reform," Vologzhin said.

People's deputy Nikolay Feskov from Belorussia believes that the plenum did not resolve and did have to resolve at once all urgent inter-ethnic problems. They are so complicated and heterogeneous that they cannot be solved overnight. According to him, the plenum's main result is the mapping out of the guidelines of development of the Soviet federation. The Communist Party Central Committee managed to unite in one programme everything valuable drawn from the pre-plenum discussion on inter-ethnic relations. Time will show how real this programme is, Feskov said.

Committees, Commissions Discuss Plan, Budget

PM2009133189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
20 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 3

[IZVESTIYA special correspondent V. Dolganov report: "The Country's Plan and Budget Discussed"]

[Text] As reported in IZVESTIYA, work resumed on 18 September in the USSR Supreme Soviet committees and commissions. We are all now setting particular store by these formations. Readers probably remember that during the sittings of the first session of the country's Supreme Soviet many deputies expressed dissatisfaction with the fact that the joint sittings of the two chambers took up too much time and that people's deputies were deprived of the opportunity to study draft legislation and prepare for the next sittings by studying statistical data, the roots of various problems, and the appropriate literature and reference works.

It is proposed to arrange the second session of the highest legislative body somewhat differently. On the first day of work by the commissions and committees, the leaders of these standing bodies and Supreme Soviet departments had a consultation with R.N. Nishanov, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities, at which it was decided to put it to the session that joint sittings of the chambers be held twice a week, on Mondays and Tuesdays, and the rest of the time be devoted to work in the committees and commissions. Of course, the session participants will have the final say, although the proposed arrangement is based directly on their wishes and is perfectly capable of normalizing the people's deputies' work. It sometimes happened during the last session that deputies who gathered in the committees and commissions after the chambers had been in session had to sit late into the night discussing draft laws and other documents.

It is difficult to report on all the sittings held the first day. In most of the premises made available to the committees and commissions in the Hotel Moskva and in the building at 4/22, Kalinin Prospekt, work was indeed in full swing from morning onwards: To all appearances, the break came in handy, as people's deputies were not only able to use this time to have a rest but also to meet with their voters and fine-tune their programs. According to many of our elected representatives, they have gained and are still gaining considerable inspiration for ideas from letters sent to the USSR Supreme Soviet. There are thousands upon thousands of these letters. In the overwhelming majority of them, people voice their sincere concern at the present economic and political situation in the country and suggest ways to solve the crisis. I think we will come back to mail from the voters when we talk about the second session of the Supreme Soviet. I will just say that the majority of them are concerned with the country's budget in one way or another.

It is not surprising that the first day of work in most of the committees and commissions was dedicated to the draft state plan and budget for 1990. Naturally, there will be a more detailed, serious discussion of these very important documents by the Soviet of the Union Planning, Budget, and Financial Commission under the chairmanship of V.G. Kucherenko. The first sitting worked out the procedure for organizing the discussion of the draft plan and budget. One would have thought that the question was strictly organizational and procedural. But now, unlike the first days of work of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, for example, our elected representatives have realized in practice that a procedural issue is by no means a formality. Consequently, the discussion was fairly long. Deputies intend not just to make some changes and additions to the draft state plan and budget but also to study the validity of various provisions in the documents, hold consultations with leading economic scientists, and analyze the reasons why items in previous plans have not been met or have been subjected to the infamous "amendments" which lead to growth in the national income deficit.

The USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for the Affairs of Veterans and Invalids under the chairmanship of N.V. Bosenko worked long hours the first day. Together with the members of other committees and commissions, its members have to hear and discuss reports by the USSR State Planning Committee [Gosplan] and USSR Ministry of Finance and draw up proposals from the committee for draft conclusions on the "Social Insurance" section of the state plan and budget for 1990. This will be the committee's chief concern in September and October. In parallel to this work, it also has to prepare a co-report on the draft USSR Law on Pensions, discuss the draft with the utmost concentration, and draw up proposals for draft laws on ownership in the USSR, cooperatives, a unified national taxation system, and many other legislative acts. Members of the committee also have to take part in the work of deputy groups—in particular, to work on draft laws on the general principles of leadership of the economy and the social sphere in the union republics.

There are also a number of questions in the work of this committee whose urgent resolution is awaited by the millions of our needy fellow citizens, pensioners, invalids, and single people. The most important questions are those of building residential accommodation for elderly people and improving living conditions in these homes, organizing special workshops and sectors at enterprises for veterans and invalids, organizing the production of modern artificial limbs and invalid chairs, and a great deal more. All the committee members are of the firm opinion that we cannot go on financing these very important matters on the basis of the sadly renowned residual principle and that the USSR State Plan and Budget for 1990 must provide for real investments capable of producing a tangible effect.

But any financing of social needs is possible only on the basis of enhancing the efficiency of all sectors of the national economy. It is precisely for this reason that

members of the Commission for Questions of the Development of Industry, Energy, Equipment, and Technology, the Commission for Labor, Prices, and Social Policy Questions, the Commission for Consumer Goods, Trade, and Municipal, Consumer, and Other Services to the Population, the Committee for the Affairs of Women and of Family, Mother, and Child Protection, and other formations of the country's highest legislative body held such detailed discussions of plans for their own work and, in particular, points connected with the state plan and budget for 1990.

Practically all of them continued their sittings on 19 September. Members of the USSR State Committee for Material and Technical Supply [Gossnab] and economic and legal specialists took part in some of them. Members of subcommittees and working groups assembled for the sittings. As before, the deputies' day was full and very intensive.

Here I should point out that, on the basis of criticism voiced by people's deputies at the last session, the Supreme Soviet Presidium and Secretariat have taken the first steps to improve the flow of information to the people's elected representatives and enhance their legal competence. The sixth floor of wing "B" of the Moskva Hotel has been taken over almost completely by the Supreme Soviet Secretariat information service. The computerized information system is the center of this service. Some 400 subjects have been fed into the electronic memory: Information on the composition of the Congress and Supreme Soviet and on each of the deputies; brief summaries of the main deputy speeches and proposals; USSR laws; statistical data on sectors' production indicators compared to those of other socialist and capitalist countries....

Specialists from the USSR Council of Ministers Information Main Administration are responsible for gathering and classifying this information and feeding it into the system. It is planned to equip all the USSR Supreme Soviet committees and commissions and the foyers of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and USSR Supreme Soviet sessions halls with similar systems in the future.

Gorbachev Meets With Farm Workers

LD2109152989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 21 Sep 89

[Text] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev met a large group of workers and collective farm workers belonging to the central electoral bodies of the party in the CPSU Central Committee today.

There was a frank and thorough conversation on a wide range of problems disturbing working people today, and on questions of the activity of the party organizations.

Comrades Slyunkov and Razumovskiy took part in the conversation, as well as heads of departments of the CPSU Central Committee. A report on the meeting will be published.

Interview With Lithuania's Brazauskas Reported

LD2209100889 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1300 GMT 15 Sep 89

[Interview with Algirdas Brazauskas, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, by correspondent Benas Rupeika; date, place not specified—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Rupeika] The central press has not yet published as promised the materials concerning the meeting of the leaders of the Baltic republics with the three members of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee including Mikhail Gorbachev. Perhaps there have been no restrictions placed on information given to the people of the republic on this matter. Therefore, my first question will be about this meeting.

[Brazauskas] The meeting was interesting. First secretaries, chairmen of the Council of Ministers and supreme soviet presidiums of all the three republics took part. The meeting lasted for more than 4 hours, it was rather long.

[Rupeika] Did it concern only the Baltics?

[Brazauskas] Yes it did. The talks were specifically about all the matters, problems, and worries which arise here every day. Speaking more in general terms I could say that three questions which are most pressing and which are of great importance both to us and the Politburo of the Central Committee have been discussed.

First: Legalization of the Soviet Union as a federal state, or rather, enhancement of all its functions on the republican level, the level of the center.

As I understood, Mikhail Gorbachev will make a broad report on this issue at the forthcoming plenum. In our conversation we also raised these issues. We have mentioned on many occasions that the concept or notion of independence or sovereignty is very pressing, and it seems that these concepts are not only pressing in the Baltic republics but also in other republics of the USSR. These are especially pressing here in our republic for a number of reasons which perhaps should not be mentioned here today. We all understand it perfectly—and what the concept of a new federation means, perhaps, is one of the main issues among all other problems existing in the whole state.

Second: Formation of a new concept of party organizations in the CPSU. Or to be more precise, preparation for the 28th Congress of the CPSU.

Preparatory work has started even without any encouragement, including in our republic. We have a discussion within the party ranks concerning the status of the republican communist party, what the rights of the party

should be, and how these can be compared, or what parallels can be drawn with the implementation of sovereignty—primarily with the concept of sovereignty which would be as we understand it today, which would be as most people of Lithuania understand it.

Of course we have to evaluate all our possibilities—environment, conditions, and as we often underline these words, our geopolitical situation. This also applies to the party. Well, I think that today this is the most difficult problem. Because the concept of the unity of the CPSU has been existing, I would say, as something unchangeable for 70 years already.

[Rupeika] Here usually a phrase or rather a thought of V.I. Lenin is quoted on this issue.

[Brazauskas] Yes, both the thought and the decisions. The congress of the Russian Communist Party which took place in the spring of 1919 adopted relevant decisions. However, at that time the USSR did not exist yet, there were no Union republics. Therefore, there were no communist parties of these republics within the framework of discussion discussed at this congress.

Today, there should be an absolutely different concept. A different concept which springs even from the concept of the state structure. This is one of the most difficult issues, especially here in our republic. We were the first ones where the question of this nature was raised among the communist organizations in this republic. The question has been raised acutely. It seems that this question will have to be scrutinized rather extensively. We have given it a wide discussion during the preparation of documents—i.e. the program and rules of the Lithuanian Communist Party. I mean draft documents for our forthcoming congress. There are many ideas and thoughts in these documents, and we were grateful to all party organizations and committees for showing great activeness.

We have prepared draft rules and a program which will be the most optimal, the most comprehensible, and under no circumstances should there be any controversial drafts so that the question might be raised: Either this draft or that should be accepted. The word alternative which has become so popular in this republic and in our life in this case should not be needed. Work of this kind should be carried out before the congress, before the preparation of draft documents for the congress.

There should be unity, especially in party matters, there should be unity because we already have many indications that the Lithuanian Communist Party—like our territory—can be split. This can be done on nationality grounds. We already have the example of Salcininkai. We would not like to see it happen within the party. If this split occurs then this will only weaken the force of each separate group, and it is doubtful whether we would be able to achieve the results and decisions which would be the most suitable for our Lithuanian and our party.

[Rupeika] Perhaps we shall return to this question again. Now, what was the third topic which was discussed in Moscow the day before yesterday?

[Brazauskas] The third question was the equality of all people. Conflicts of nationalist nature are displayed both here in the Baltic region and other areas of the USSR or republics today. Even actions of a different kind. Or simply—laws and decisions are adopted which discriminate against individual groups of people living in a certain, specific region or part of the country.

This is a very difficult problem whilch provokes such negative phenomena like the political strikes which took place in Moldavia and Estonia. These are possible in other places too. We would like to have them in this republic.

Developed states of the world pay great attention to the issue of equality of people—that is legislation of equal rights and equality among people.

Concluding the meeting, Comrade Gorbachev said they would support our wise and positive steps in consolidating all the forces in our republics. He said we trust in the future. Of course, this gave us some moral support.

Lithuanian Party Backs Sovereign Lithuanian State

LD2109224489 Vilnius in English to North America 2200 GMT 21 Sep 89

[Text] The draft program outline of the Lithuanian Communist Party will be published tomorrow for nationwide discussion. It says that the current social, economic and political situation stepped up democratization in Lithuania's national rebirth, and its striving to create a sovereign state posed new tasks to the Lithuanian Communist Party.

Wishing to be the political force to create an independent legal Lithuanian State, the Lithuanian Communist Party itself becomes an (?instant party) in the process of restructuring. It has a common ideological platform with the Communist Parties of the Soviet Union and the other republics, as well as the Communist orientation based on the Marxist dialectical approach to historial development, to reality and its phenomena. This provides the foundation for equal mutual ties, says the draft program outline. Those equal mutual ties must be legalized when forming the leading party bodies and developing its whole policy.

The Lithuanian Communist Party condemns outspokenly the errors in its former activity and the crimes against humanity committed on its behalf. The Lithuanian Communist Party disassociates itself categorically from the Stalinist legacy, the administrative-command model of socialism and the dogmatic interpretation of Marxism-Leninism. (?Let's) follow the general goals and principles of the Party's activity, the Party's nationalities policy, the Party's socioeconomic policy and the fourth section the Party and culture, outlining the program

principles, (?strivings) and goals of an independent Lithuanian Communist Party.

In brief, it comes out for a sovereign Lithuanian State having cultural and economic links with the Soviet Union's republics and other countries. A sovereign or independent Lithuanian Republic means that its citizens themselves decide all the issues of social, economic, political and cultural life on their own.

The Lithuanian Communist Party, which has declared the principle Lithuania without sovereignty is Lithuania without a future, proceeds from the will of the Lithuanian nation and Lithuanian society at large. That's why it is striving to create a social order which would guarantee Lithuanian sovereignty and free life of the nation (?on the lines of) its fathers and forefathers, says the draft program outline of the Lithuanian Communist Party.

This draft is likely to cause a controversial response in Lithuania.

Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Passes Resolution

LD2109224889 Vilnius in English to North America 2200 GMT 21 Sep 89

[Text] Lithuania's Supreme Soviet Presidium passed a resolution today [21 September] annulling the decisions of two local soviets of people's deputies on the proclamation of self-governing Polish national territorial units within Lithuania. These decisions incite interethnic discord and contradict Lithuania's Constitution, as well as the law on district soviets of people's deputies, says the resolution of the Supreme Soviet Presidium.

The same resolution recommends Lithuania's Council of Ministers to consider the two districts' economic, cultural, and social problems and to outline the prospects of development taking into consideration their peculiarities and the needs of the Lithuanians, Poles, Belorussians and people of other nationalities residing there.

Another resolution passed by Lithuania's Supreme Soviet Presidium commissions the Council of Ministers to set up a nationalities committee under Lithuania's Council of Ministers.

New Lithuanian Sajudis Newspaper Published

LD2109172989 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0900 GMT 16 Sep 89

[Summary] RESPUBLIKA [republic], a new newspaper published by the Sajudis reform movement, appeared in Vilnius today. The editors said that the paper would be published in Russian, Polish, and English.

At the moment the paper will appear twice a week; however, after the new year it will be published daily.

The first issue of the paper includes an interview with A. Brazauskas, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party, Cardinal Sladkevicius, and Professor Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Seimas Council.

Ryzhkov Visits Novgorod District 21 Sep

LD2109225389 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 21 Sep 89

[Excerpts] Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov visited Novgorod today [21 September]. Listen to what our correspondent Vladimir Batalov reports on this.

[Batalov] From the airport Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov set off to the Kompleks Production Association.

This is one of Novogorod's largest industrial enterprises. It turns out cassette video tape recorders, robot technology complexes, transformers, and power supply blocks. On the whole, the range of output from this association is huge. At this enterprise questions of saturating the market as soon as possible with video tape recorders and other equipment were touched upon.

Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov enquired about the work of the people engaged in technological design. [passage omitted]

On the territory of the enterprise meetings took place with workers of the association. The most diverse questions were touched upon. The Novgoroders were angry about a publication in IZVESTIYA regarding the creation of a free economic zone.

[Begin recording] [Ryzhkov] I altogether don't understand what this is all about.

[Woman] Nor do we, and that's why we want someone to come and explain it to us.

[Ryzhkov] You know, today I learned of your sector or zone in the coach when being driven from the aircraft to Novogorod. En route the chairman of the executive committee told me about it. I started to ask questions, saying that reference is made to the government having made some decision; I say, then it is up to me as head of the government what we have adopted. We did not know anything. There are very many ideas. I say, you are wasting your efforts on this matter. A project has been developed and the Finns proposed it for Vyborg. But I only heard today that there is one for Novgorod. And I told the comrades: Well, okay, if a joint enterprise is needed, please go ahead, a joint hotel, a joint works, so that it would be advantageous to us and, say, also to the Finns. We do not object to this. But how can you fence something off and say it's a special zone? Here people will live in one way and in another place in a different way.

[Woman] [words indistinct] After all, what did Gorbachev say? He said: If a worker does a certain amount of work that is how much he gets.

[Ryzhkov] And we believe that one should receive what one has earned. But there is one thing you should understand. You are the leading working class, comrades. You are educated people. Look at what is happening. Let's take a look at what is happening today. We are making more television sets than last year and we are

also making more radio receivers, more refrigerators, more freezers. But where are they? I am asking you: Where are they? Where are they?

But wages, the earnings of the populations have risen by 12 percent in one year!

[Woman] There are no goods.

[Ryzhkov] We have produced only 2.5 percent output, while wages have increased by 12 percent. I agree, let everyone earn as much as he likes—even a million—but he must produce a million's worth of goods. If money has no real value, the situation in the shops will always be the same as it is now. Have you got any good shops?

[Woman] For the time being not a single one.

[Second woman] Yes.

[Ryzhkov] [words indistinct]

[Woman] The Kooptorg [cooperative trade shop] is good sometimes.

[Ryzhkov] The Kooptorg?

[Woman] Yes, on the day and hour when goods are delivered.

[Ryzhkov] And Uzbekistan, what kind of a shop is that?

[Man] This is the cooperative trade shop.

[Ryzhkov] We are now about to go there. [end recording]

[Batalov] Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov visited the shops of Novgorod. The conversations with customers discussed the organization of trade and mainly the prices of output.

[Begin recording] [Ryzhkov] How much pension do you receive?

[Woman] One hundred and twenty [currency not specified].

[Ryzhkov] One hundred and twenty?

[Woman] Yes. After all we are paying R4, R8, or R10 for sausage we are paying R10. This is, of course, expensive for a pensioner. [end recording]

[Batalov] A year ago a government decision was adopted on the comprehensive reconstruction and restoration of the monuments of history and culture of two ancient towns—Novgorod and Pskov. Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov visited the churches and monasteries and enquired about the progress of restoration work. After all, they are have been in progress for more tha almost 2 decades. At the Troitskoye dig, Comrade Ryzhkov was given explanations by the leader of the archaeological expedition Valentin Lavrentyevich (Yany). [passage omitted]

[Batalov] The Novgorodskiy state farm was the last visit by Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov's in this ancient land. [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1950 GMT on 21 September carries a 1-minute report on Ryzhkov's visit to Novgorod, which adds the following:

"On the same day comrade Ryzhkov left Novgorod"].

Strikers Demand Right To Leave Contaminated Zone

18220206 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 16 Sep 89 p 4

[Article by A. Gulyayev, SELSKAYA ZHIZN correspondent: "A Strike in the 'Zone'"]

[Text] Gomel, 14 Sep. Nearly 300 people gathered yesterday in the central square of the small Belorussian city of Narovlya for an unsanctioned meeting in front of the rayon party committee. All of these people were representatives of enterprises which had not opened for work that day: the local hydroapparatus plant, a motor vehicle detachment, PMK-20, a confectionary factory, and Selkhozkhimiya.

The reason for the strike, which is an unusual phenomenon for Belorussia, and particularly for a rural area, is the slow and often unsatisfactory resolution of problems connected with liquidating the consequences of the Chernobyl catastrophe. Narovlyanskiy Rayon is one of the areas suffering most from radioactive contamination. The strikers' basic demand is to grant to each person who wishes the right to leave the contaminated zone and to receive compensation for leaving his home and to build another where his health will not be endangered. This is already the second such action taken in Narovlya. The first strike took place on 21 June and lasted for four days.

Moldavian Strike Committee Member Interviewed

LD2109231489 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 21 Sep 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Correspondent] Bendery is one of the strike centers of Moldavia. Well, the Elektrofarfor factory which we visited today has been working for several days. And although the workers here express solidarity with the strikers' demands, the collective has abandoned its political strike. The switching of the enterprise to lease has been a strong argument. What about the others? We're at the neighboring factory, Elektroapparatura:

[Begin video interview] [Strike committee member Mitryan] The strike committee at our factory has already taken a decision to call off the strike in connection with the results of the work of the plenum of the CPSU Central Committee. Only we're now working on coordinating our actions with the town strike committee and (?naturally with the republican committee). So yesterday we had a meeting of the town strike committee and the great majority of the leaders of the strike committees and of the collectives support our viewpoint.

[Correspondent] But supposing the republican strike committee takes another view?

[Mitryan] Well, in our strike committee several tendencies have taken shape, let's put it like that. There are the extremist forces which have shown up, who are taking a certain stance and refusing to change their point of view. There are also sensible men, and I think they're the majority, hoping that they'll understand us and go along with us. Very serious documents have been adopted—documents which I think satisfy all the nations and nationalities of the union, and therefore our only correct decision, in support of those decisions, is to halt the strike. [video shows factories and interview] [end video interview]

Armenian Supreme Soviet Appeals for Blockade End

LD2209094389 Moscow World Service in English 0700 GMT 22 Sep 89

[Excerpt] The Supreme Soviet of Armenia in the Caucasus has asked the USSR Supreme Soviet for urgent help. It has found itself in an economic blockade. Neighboring Azerbaijan holds up goods and various supplies heading to Armenia by rail and road. There are already shortages of food and fuel. Many of the factories are on the brink of a stoppage. Not a single newspaper came out in Armenia on Thursday because of the absence of paper.

Uzbekistan's KGB Arrests Drug Smugglers

LD2109185389 Moscow TASS in English 1447 GMT 21 Sep 89

[Text] Termez September 21 TASS—Central Asian Uzbekistan's KGB and customs officers have detained four men, all Soviet nationals, as they attempted to smuggle 25 kilograms of narcotics into the country from Afghanistan through the border checkpoint in Termez.

The drug traffickers were found carrying 20 kilograms of opium hidden in fuel cans and another five kilograms of opium and hashish concealed elsewhere.

In addition, over 800,000 roubles were found on the men, who are now under investigation.

Selected Speeches From AUCCTU Plenum Reported

18280284b Moscow TRUD in Russian 7 Sep 89 pp 1-5

[Report on speeches at AUCCTU (All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions) Plenum by F.S. Sderzhikov, chairman of the Donetsk Oblast Trade Union Council; I.A. Shinkevich, chairman of the Central Committee of the Trade Union of Workers of Rail Transportation and Transport Construction; A.V. Kharpach, secretary of the Gukovo Territorial Trade Union Committee of Coal Industry Workers (Rostov Oblast); V.A. Yarin, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet; V.P. Shcherbakov, member of the Moscow City Trade Union Council; V.I. Goncharik, chairman of the Belorussian Republic Trade Union Council; V.K. Borodin, chairman of the Central Committee of the Trade Union of the Chemical and Petrochemical Industry; A.T. Popravka, locomotive engineer of the Novosibirsk locomotive depot, West Siberian Railroad; G.F. Budyak, chairman of the Trade Union Committee of the Moscow Aviation Institute; D.A. Akkoshkarov, tunneler foreman at the 50th Anniversary of October Revolution mine (Karaganda Oblast); all speeches published with "slight abridgments"]

[Excerpts] I wish to emphasize—F.S. SDERZHIKOV, chairman of the Donetsk Oblast Trade Union Council, began his speech—the significance of the moment and of the issues we are discussing in connection with, let us be frank, extraordinarily important circumstances. It is not enough to say that they are complicated. They are radically different from those that existed even 2 months ago when we were convinced that we were doing a good deal for perestroyka and that the rates of development of production corresponded to the 5-year assignment and the priorities in social issues were being provided for. The strikes that began in the Kuzbass and spread to all branches and enterprises of the country refuted our ideas.

The workers do not wish to wait a long time for radical changes in the conditions and payment for labor or the rates of housing construction, changes in the ecological situation, or solutions to other problems. Let us be frank: The economic base for solving them will be created under the 13th 5-Year Plan at best—this is what many scholars assert. The rates of development of the national economy are not increasing but, because of the strikes, have dropped sharply. When analyzing the causes and results of the miners' strikes one cannot but recall that the problems raised by the strikers had previously been mentioned repeatedly at party and trade union congresses, in the government of the country and the republics, and in the central press. Just during the past 2 and a half years the central and republic newspapers have published more than 20 articles on problems of granting the mines economic independence, financing the reconstruction of the mines by the Ministry of the Coal Industry, the construction of social and cultural facilities, improvement of the ecological situation and the conditions and protection of labor, the provision of household fuel for the population, and the prolonged technical retooling of production. After this is it really possible to tell us that we have gotten rid of the stereotype attitude of the previous party and government leadership toward the interests of the regions, toward the interests of the workers. And the lack of confidence which we are experiencing today is directly related to the arrears of the trade unions in carrying out party, political, and economic reforms. For only today is the AUCCTU really considering these problems on a large scale after the lessons of the strikes.

Supporting the proposals made in the speech by S.A. Shalayev concerning the basic direction for restructuring the work of the trade unions, I wish to note that the

AUCCTU must determine more constructively the measures for stabilizing the work of the mining collectives and render practical assistance in the local areas in order to overcome the consequences of the strikes. They must fulfill the agreements made between the miners and the government commission and also the packages of demands of collectives of enterprises of other branches. The Donbass, Kuzbass, and other coal regions can no longer be left, one after the other, in these difficult situations. The work rhythm is being interrupted and even now there are interruptions in the power supply and entire enterprises are being shut down for various periods of time—and this is a deciding part of the preparations for winter. The workers' moods are negatively affected by the slowness in meeting requirements for improving food supply. We have no clear information regarding this yet.

I must not fail to mention the stepping up of the activity of various extremist organizations in the Baltic area, Moscow, and the Western Ukraine where suddenly everyone is filled with love for the miners and are constantly sending "emissaries" to the Donbass. In this connection I suggest that we demand that the government create right there in the coal regions its own authorized work groups who are capable in conjunction with representatives of local control organs, of organizing fulfillment of the decrees of the USSR Council of Ministers and coordinated actions for meeting the demands of the strikers.

Taking into account the fact that the situation in the mines is not improving—the material and technical support and labor and technological discipline have deteriorated; production injuries are on the rise; since the strike the mines of the oblast are failing do deliver 50,000-60,000 tonnes of coal each day and in 2 months 3 million tonnes have been lost; and direct losses have exceeded R120 million—we consider it necessary for the ministry staff to be constantly present in the Donbass so it can work constantly with the trade union central committee, which has recently been excessively involved in activity that has little to do with production. Many problems continue to be solved by the rally method in violation of labor and legal legislation.

We are especially concerned about the wholesale campaign to replace business and engineering and technical personnel, which aggravates relations between workers and management. One can see a tendency toward firing leaders who are demanding and principled. And is it not time for our organs for monitoring the observance of legislation to conduct explanatory work more energetically? Why do we tolerate those whose actions violate our socialist norms and laws: At rallies they are even firing leaders who are deputies without asking anyone.

I shall say frankly that even now many have not looked into our fair warning that, in the interests of labor safety, we cannot allow a total replacement of engineering and technical personnel: Thousands of people are working in the mines under especially dangerous conditions and they need skilled and firm leadership. I am sure that we do not have enough persistence or consistency in our opposition to the creation of new informal organizations, committees, groups, and unions either, although it is obvious that we already have more than enough organizations and unions.

Comrades, I wish to discuss our preparations for elections. At meetings on all fronts they are actively preparing for the election campaign, but we are late again. We must nominate alternative candidates in the majority of okrugs. The assertion of certain people that the workers are not capable of defending their own interests was refuted in the strikes and is being refuted by the historical experience and wisdom of the working man.

The report emphasized the special need to strengthen the protection of the trade union workers and the aktiv. Many strike committees are making these demands and we are grateful to them for this. This point should be especially carefully and precisely formulated in the law on the rights of trade unions. The point presented in the section entitled "development of democracy within the trade union" must envision the permanent participation of AUCCTU members in the work of the trade union committees of local organizations. We must immediately publish a "Guide for the Trade Union Worker" which is new in spirit and content.

Various issues having to do with renewing trade union life have been raised in direct and pointed form here at the plenum of the oblast trade union conference. We have discussed the weak accountability for the irresponsibility of ministry workers, the lack of ministry participation in solving personnel problems, the shortcomings in providing information for the trade union aktiv, and, as Comrade Romanov has already noted here, the inadequate use of the mass media by the AUCCTU, and the lack of opposition to various groupings that are waging an active battle against the trade unions.

We are now taking comprehensive measures to render assistance to the miners and we are "sitting" permanently in the mines and on the strike committees. Against this background the position of many central trade union committees who are stirring up trouble about the restructuring again from above and the distribution of trade union funds seems even more strange. Is this really the time for mutual reproaches and accusations? One of the workers of the central committee of the trade union of coal industry workers in the newspaper SOVETSKAYA KULTURA made some suggestions that are strange to say the least. Now we must, on the contrary, join forces to render assistance to local organizations and trade union committees; that is, to those who are solving the practical problems for stabilizing the situation in collectives of the branch. I think that the trade union central committee, working with the ministries, should delve deeply into the formation of the social programs of the 13th 5-Year Plan and devote primary

attention to such extremely critical problems as normalization of the temperatures in the mines and mechanization of the removal of coal from steep faces. And we, in turn, along with the oblast soviet of people's deputies, are carefully working out a plan for the socioeconomic development of the oblast.

The AUCCTU plenum must demand that the Ministry of the Coal Industry solve the problem of cooling the air as quickly as possible, for 28,000 miners are working under unacceptable temperature conditions. We are no less disturbed by the problems of the collectives of other branches whose demands have already been presented. Enterprises of the oblast economy have been provided with only 50 percent of the necessary ventilation equipment and half of it is not working because of disrepair. Not a single one of the ministries of the heavy industry branches has responded to a single one of our letters, not to mention taking measures. Such an attitude toward working conditions and trade union demands entails serious consequences. This is why we need serious legal levers and this is why the legislators must make haste in adopting the law on the rights of trade unions. The second variant of the draft, as was noted here, is considerably better than the first. Having received a high-quality law on strikes and having restructured themselves, the trade unions must win confidence and use legal means to fight for the legitimate interests of the workers. We would like to see the AUCCTU and the USSR people's deputies from the trade unions as active, reliable people implementing the decrees adopted by today's plenum.

The question raised for the consideration of the AUCCTU plenum today is a very important one in the activity of USSR trade unions during this difficult period of perestroyka—noted the chairman of the Central Committee of the Trade Union of Workers of Rail Transportation and Transport Construction, I.A. SHINKEVICH, in his speech.

In S.A. Shalayev's speech, he said, one could hear concrete proposals for restructuring trade union activity. These proposals were advanced by life itself, by the perestroyka process, and, as they say, have been knocking on the door for a long time. And if we were to approach these problems in such a balanced and serious way even a year or a year and a half ago it would have been possible to clearly orient our trade union organizations and enable them to act more independently without looking around at others, and, on the whole, strengthen the position of the trade unions as protectors of the rights and interests of the workers. Events in a number of regions of the country in recent months have shown that workers of the country grasped more rapidly than many of the trade union leaders the spirit of the restructuring being conducted by the party, and through their resolute actions have forced us to revise the role and tasks of the trade unions in the modern stage—radically, I hope. We have been given a chance to win the respect and trust of the workers, and we must take advantage of this chance and do everything possible so that the trade unions will actually do what they were meant to do.

For many years when the trade unions were playing the role of so-called "drive belts" they had to perform a large number of functions that were not properly within their domain. The trade unions participated in almost everything and are still doing so today. If the plan is not being fulfilled, if product quality is poor, if the technical level is low, if nonproductive losses are great, if social organizations are not working well (and many, many other things)—the trade unions are responsible. And their forces were dispersed in this multitude of functions and the workers were unable to notice the most important and necessary function of the trade unions—protecting the legitimate rights and interests of the workers.

Now we must immediately get rid of everything that has been imposed on us, that is not properly within the domain of the trade unions, and engage in precisely our own work—the work of protecting the workers. And we must do this immediately without waiting for the publication of the law on the rights of workers or other decisions. Taking this into account, we must simply begin to develop a new edition of the regulations of USSR trade unions and also the regulations of the branch trade unions. It is quite possible that such a reorientation of the activity of the trade unions will not please everyone and there will obviously be criticism and reproaches, but we should not fear this. I am sure that the concentration of the attention of the trade unions only on protective functions will be approved and supported by our workers and will contribute to the further acceleration and deepening of perestroyka and increased respect and confidence in the trade unions.

I would also consider it expedient to use the mass media more boldly and extensively to elucidate the steps that are being taken by the AUCCTU, the trade union central committees, and the trade union councils for protection of the rights and legitimate interests of the workers. How do these organs raise issues in the ministries, departments, councils of ministers, and other echelons? Thus we shall not only answer to the rank-and-file members of the trade union for the work we are doing, but also provide an example of how to defend the interests of the workers, if, of course, we actually do defend them.

But regardless of the decisions we may make today, regardless of the recommendations we may develop, even the very best, they will be implemented and utilized in practical work by the trade union committees and our trade union activists.

I think that all of us support that part of the draft law on trade union rights where it suggests strengthening the social protection of the elected trade union workers and trade union activists. There is no doubt that this will contribute to increasing the adherence to principles and the activity of the trade unions, but this is not enough. In order for the trade union organs to attract trade union

cadres, they must pay them well. In the national economy this goes without saying, and a good deal has recently been done in this area with our active support. But when it comes to wages for trade union workers and workers of other social organizations, it is considered improper or even unethical to speak of this. But are these people any different? Do they not have families? Do they not have other needs?

The first step toward raising wages has been taken and it is producing positive results, but this pertains only to the local trade union organizations while the cadres of rayon and other levels and technical inspection teams continue to receive miserly wages. Good, experienced workers go into economic work. We must solve this problem, and as quickly as possible. This means attracting good personnel, including workers, who will quickly advance the cause of perestroyka in the trade unions.

It is correctly stated in the speech that the strike is a double-edged weapon. National economic losses from them sometimes exceed the means necessary for satisfying the legitimate demands of the strikers. And not only the strikers but also those on whom the necessary decisions depend should be aware of this.

At the end of July and the beginning of August many labor collectives in rail transportation insisted on striking since the working conditions and the social position of workers of the branch are in a neglected state. Trade union organizations of the branch and the trade union central committee, while recognizing as valid and on the whole supporting the demands of the railroad workers, judged the situation that had been created and decided not to resort to strikes since they think that halting the operation of transportation would fully paralyze the country's economy, which is in bad condition to begin with, and deal a serious blow to perestroyka. At the same time we sent a number of demands to the government. At a conference of the leaders of the ministries and departments involved which was held on instructions for the Council of Ministers, these were recognized as justified. But more than a month passed and there were no decisions regarding the issues that had been raised. The railroad workers, understanding their role and responsibility to the country, are continuing to work and are waiting for the USSR Council of Ministers to take a responsible stand regarding their demands and for the AUCCTU to give them real support.

I should like to say a couple of words about the draft law on the rights of trade unions that is being prepared. The last variant is much better than the draft that was initially published. This was the result of the interest of a broad segment of the trade union aktiv and the rank-and-file trade union members in this document. In our trade union alone during the discussion of the draft law more than 12,000 suggestions, additions, and critical remarks were made. Approximately 70 percent of them pertained to increasing the protective functions of the trade unions, increasing the independence of the trade union organizations, and relieving them of duties that are not properly within their domain.

Taking this into account, we developed and submitted to the AUCCTU an alternative draft law. Many of its provisions were included in or reiterate the draft law submitted to AUCCTU members. But some of them were not taken into account.

The report presented a number of demands the trade unions could make to the government. The first of these demands was to freeze prices for the basic industrial and food commodities. While not objecting to freezing prices, I do not think we shall achieve anything by this since in this situation it is impossible to establish effective control over prices. It would be expedient instead of freezing prices or at least in addition to this to accelerate the growth of wages depending on the price index. Incidentally, this would be in keeping with the preelection platform of the trade unions. [passage omitted]

The floor was turned over to the secretary of the Gukovo Territorial Trade Union Committee of Coal Industry Workers (Rostov Oblast), A.V. KHRAPACH. The questions being discussed on today's agenda are the most crucial ones for coal industry workers since the mass miners' strikes have confirmed that there are urgent tasks for the trade unions in the current stage of perestroyka, he noted. The strike movement of the miners was above all a consequence of stagnation in the political and economic life of the country and a bureaucratic attitude toward the demands of the workers when resolving many issues of a professional, economic, and social nature that had been accumulating over the decades. But it is not only the dictatorship of the economic organs that is to blame in this situation—the trade unions are also to blame for the unsolved problems that are pushing the workers to extreme measures.

Analyzing the 9-day strike at the 60-Letiye Leninskiy Komsomol mine and the complicated situations at other mines of our region where there is conflict and they sometimes seem to be on the verge of a strike—and I have in mind the eastern Donbass and Rostov Oblast—one comes to the conclusion that the trade union committees have become accustomed to taking the difficulties of the managers into account and looking at the situation through their eyes and that they do not have sufficient rights to oppose the dictatorship of the departments and achieve a real improvement in the life of the people. I must say that the majority of trade union committees have become confused, they do not know which side they are on, and they have been waiting for orders from above: from the central committee, the trade union committee, and, one must admit, above all from the city party committee.

Why have the trade unions not spoken out previously in defense of worker interests? In the first place they have been under the influence of the idea that state interests are the most important. At that time it seemed that without forced, priority development of production it

was impossible to move forward. On the other hand I would say that we have not always resolutely come to the firing line when social problems have been resolved according to the residual principle.

I would also like to discuss the draft law on the rights of trade unions. The time for adopting this law—and it would be best to call it the law on USSR trade unions—has been stretched to the limit. Therefore I think the most important task is to resolve today the problem of a final variant of the law on trade unions.

I wish to make a number of specific suggestions. The decisions of the second and third AUCCTU plenums granted great independence to local organizations, right up to the point of solving financial problems. Positive and negative work experience are being accumulated. There is much that is conservative in this business and many blunders. But the main thing is that the trade unions are now saying: Thank you for these 65 percent of the membership dues which remain with the local organizations and the additional payments to the nonstaff trade union aktiv. But why, for instance, is it stipulated that one can pay additional money to the chairman of the shop committee made up of workers? Why can the trade union committee not independently solve problems of whom to pay since it knows who works there and how they work? I think the trade union committees should be given independence, the kind of independence the miners were demanding. Every trade union committee has the right to decide who should work there and what he should do.

Second. It is necessary to strengthen the independence and protection of the trade union committees. Of course they must be protected by their labor collectives and their support. But by the law as well. It is important to emphasize this now when we are discussing the draft law on the right of trade unions. Our trade union activists think that in order to do this, among other measures, not only trade union committees with the status of rayon committees, but all trade union committees should be given the right to express a lack of confidence in the administration for a failure to carry out measures for the protection of labor so that the manager who deals with labor legislation arbitrarily and does not consider the demands of the trade union or ignores them will know that the labor collective whose interests the trade union committee represents will not put up with this. And the trade union committee should have the opportunity to clearly express the will of the collective. For it is not without reason that similar demands for replacement of leaders of the highest rank who have not justified the confidence of the workers were raised during the recent miners' strikes. And in many cases these demands were satisfied.

Another thing: It is time for the trade unions to stop persuading negligent and irresponsible subdivision managers and other specialists to observe the provisions of the collective agreement and the law and to stop proliferating papers with the same old words "to demand" and "to obligate." The trade union committees must be given the right to solve these problems more radically right down to imposing trade union committee fines on these managers for violations just as the technical and legal inspectorates do.

It is necessary to protect trade union leaders who take principled, uncompromising positions when it comes to the interests of the workers and who will not go against their conscience in order to provide themselves with a soft job in the future in the event they are not reelected. We must make a rule: It is possible to fire the former trade union worker only with the agreement of the higher trade union organ, regardless of how long it has been since the worker left trade union work. This way we shall deprive zealous administrators holding a grudge against trade union activists who at one time have bothered them of the slightest chance of settling accounts with principled representatives and members of trade union committees, and we shall protect and secure them from persecution and punishment. And finally it is necessary to eliminate formalism and the oppression of all kinds of instructions and we must trust the local trade union organizations and trade union committees more. Trade union organizations have a better idea of what they should do and they do not need our advice; this will only make them lose their stride.

And the last thing. I support Comrade Romanov's proposal to create a secretariat of the AUCCTU for the affairs of Russia and a Russian republic trade union council. [passage omitted]

The floor is turned over to an operator of the Nizhnyy Tagil Metallurgical Combine, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet, V.A. YARIN. It is gratifying that our proposal to invite representatives of the labor collectives to the AUCCTU plenum was accepted, V.A. Yarin said, and today I see many of my comrades who are not AUCCTU members but who are participating in the work of the plenum.

Let me tell you straight out that I am uneasy about what is happening in the hall. For some reason we think that if we adopt the law on trade unions today, if we adopt the law on strikes, all of our problems will be solved. Anyone who thinks that is proceeding from old positions and is counting on spending another 10 years in one management position or another. The problems are much deeper. The problem has to do with our position, the role of the trade unions. What is this, in our view?

Just look—the demands of the strike committee immediately struck a responsive chord in the hearts of everyone and the mechanism immediately went into motion so as to eliminate various omissions in one region or another. But had the trade union really not raised these questions previously? At any level: at the workers' meeting, from the activist, from the leadership? But everyone received it like this: Go ahead and talk, you will not bother us. In other words, the system is not

accepting the trade union. And therefore today it is not the law that will protect the trade union, but a breakdown of the system.

I think we need a second party. The trade union—the union of people of honest labor—should, if necessary, comprise a healthy opposition to the party. And in order to do this it is necessary to make a decision today to elect people to the Politburo immediately. A man of honest labor should be in charge of the party. We are afraid, we are afraid of everything. If someone must show reasonable initiative, let us do it. And today let us analyze how much that is reasonable has been generated by various trade union leaders.

Now about Russia. I understand the cluster of problems that has enshrouded that long-suffering republic, which has been divided and exploited within the framework of international aid to all who surround it. Today there is no way for us to turn the thinking around. So how much time will it take to protect the interests of Russia completely? Today the republic's leaders are telling us that this will be difficult. And why did you not anticipate this difficulty beforehand? I shall tell you more. In a discussion with Academician Abalkin following the speech about Russia, he said to me: "Veniamin Aleksandrovich, where were you earlier?"

I hemmed and hawed. Where were our scientific minds who live in Russia? Why is it that with great strain we are finally doing economic calculations today—regional, oblast, and so forth—only within the framework of some small city or oblast, of some region, say, the Urals or Sverdlovsk Oblast? For it will take decades just to restore that region. We of Tagil are ready to stop work in the city today. But what will this do for us? Therefore along with the strike committee we have made a decision to speak with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and we are asking everyone to listen to the problems of the working city, the tired city, at a meeting of the Council of Ministers. Adopt a program within the framework of the union: What needs to be done at the combine which for 50 years has given the country nothing but profit and today can hardly make ends meet? We do not want to strike; we want to work, but we must know what masters of labor can do. And all this must be done within the framework of all of Russia. But we shall not find mutual understanding anywhere.

There are about 100 cities like Tagil. And if we were asked: "Comrades, what do you want?"—we would answer that we do not want anything, we are not asking for anything. We are asking for only one thing: Let us be the masters of our labor. Let me sell 10 percent of the products I produce. But I have been deceived even here, comrades. They say to me—the state order. But at the same time they call in the director and say: "Here is this 5 percent you receive for maneuvering and you have spent it there and there and there." How long will this go on? What reasonable thing can the trade union do about this? Through the members of the Politburo—the workers, representatives of the labor collectives—we must pointedly raise the question on the scale of the country. Within the framework of the party.

Comrades, I ask that you consider our proposal attentively. Lenin's idea about leadership of the country through the working man must be resurrected. [passage omitted]

The floor is turned over to the chairman of the Moscow City Trade Union Council, V.P. SHCHERBAKOV. The situation in which the trade unions have ended up today, we must candidly admit, is critical—he began his speech. Social processes are developing so rapidly that if we are not able to evaluate them correctly, if we are not able to determine our place in them, we might not be able to keep up with events. It is now that the trade unions have the opportunity to win the confidence of the workers, and we must be able to see this. Life is presenting us with the most critical problems and the labor collectives are demanding effective actions from the trade union leaders of the highest organs and the trade union committees in defense of their rights, and frequently they are not receiving clear answers.

Why are there so few real leaders among the managers of the trade unions, from the local units to the AUCCTU? Why is it that we, who have a stable organizational structure that has developed over decades and a solid apparatus of trained activists, shy away from the real demands of the people? What is the real reason for the condition in which the trade unions have found themselves and what must be done to get out of it? I shall not go into a detailed analysis; a good deal is said about this in the report; but the main thing is that the trade union organizations over many years have turned into an appendage of the state structure, an executive organ of the party apparatus. Because their work has proceeded in too many directions, the trade unions have lost their identity, to the detriment of the main thing—protecting the rights and interests of the workers and fighting for social justice for each and every individual. The economic reform, economic accountability, leasing relations, and cooperation, in spite of expectations, have entailed a number of negative phenomena and have aggravated the socioeconomic situation in the country. Taking into account the entire situation, which has not developed in the best possible way and is constantly becoming worse, of all their functions the trade unions should keep only those that are directly related to solving today's problems and meeting the demands of the workers: questions of wages, the standard of living, working conditions and protection of labor, health protection, and legal protection of workers, including employment insurance.

I wish to support the statement of the chairman of the Leningrad Oblast Trade Union Council, Vladislav Ivanovich Korzhov, printed on the pages of the newspaper TRUD concerning the need to protect our organization's independence, which should be clearly and unequivocally stated in the law on trade union rights. So that people will know the position of the trade unions.

the Moscow City Council of Trade Unions has suggested including in the draft declaration of the AUCCTU the following demands addressed to the government: to take immediate concrete measures for stabilizing the standard of living of the workers and making the wages of workers and employees mean something; to tax the wage fund of enterprises only after taking the country's inflation rate into account, keeping in mind that the untaxed increase in the wage fund should be no less than the inflation level. Today the level of inflation is 7 percent and the growth of wages actually permitted is 3 percent—we are deliberately causing a lowering of the standard of living. The measures for improving the economic mechanism that have been prepared and submitted for discussion of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the union republics should not create preconditions for the appearance of unemployment.

We are demanding that within a month the state organs determine and publish a subsistence minimum for all regions of the country and methods for calculating it and introduce a cost-of-living index, and when it changes, that they adjust wages, stipends, allowances, and pensions. Within a month they must introduce the maximum prices for goods in daily demand; before the end of the year they must eliminate the shortage of necessities; each quarter they must publish data on the inflation level in the country; they must introduce an effective system of taxation which should contain a mechanism for redistribution of excess incomes in favor of the underprivileged segments of society; and they must immediately take measures to eliminate distortions in the cooperative movement. We consider it necessary to instruct the USSR people's deputies from the trade unions to make sure that legislative acts concerning these issues are adopted.

At the same time we must—and can—make our contribution to solving a number of problems. We must straighten out and put a stop to the distribution of trade union money to various societies and funds for the support of departmental organizations, for conducting elaborate festivals and celebrations, and we must concentrate and use these funds for carrying out social programs which we could suggest in addition to those developed by state and economic organs. Trade union programs as such. Thus in Moscow we could accelerate the implementation of measures envisioned by the social passports and we already plan to build a number of public health facilities and equip them with trade union funds—a maternity home and a boarding house for the elderly and disabled labor veterans—and we have begun to render assistance to underprivileged segments of the population and families with many children.

We need money for the construction and reconstruction of trade union sanatoriums for in the Moscow area during the past 30 years not a single trade union sanatorium has been constructed and yet there are 17 million people living in Moscow and the oblast. There is no place for them to have treatment or recreation, and for the 6 million trade union members in the capital last year we were given 700 passes for cardiology treatment and this year, 1,200. The situation has become especially difficult now. People will not go to Georgia, the Baltic republics, Moldavia, Armenia, or Azerbaijan where a considerable proportion of the health facilities are concentrated; people will not go there because of the aggravation of interethnic relations. So let us construct them in the RSFSR.

The list of areas for the application of the efforts of trade unions could be continued. People must know that their membership fees and social security funds are not being dispersed but are being used to solve urgent problems. This is a function that should be taken over by the trade union bank on whose creation we are now working. It is intended to combine free monetary funds of branch trade unions and departmental organizations on a voluntary basis. The trade unions' money will be actively put into circulation in the interests of the trade union members.

I would consider urgent the question of creating a Russian Federation trade union organization, which the speakers have already discussed. Today the RSFSR, where 76 million trade union members or 54 percent of those in the country are working, is the only republic that does not have its own trade union organ. References to the fact that the AUCCTU represents the republic's interests do not stand up under criticism. There are staff workers who look out for this region but we need a real council of representatives of trade unions in the federation which would really fulfill the social orders of the trade union organizations and would be independent as an elected organ. Under the conditions of Russian republic independence, by solving numerous economic, social, and interethnic problems, it would protect the interests of the trade unions in the republic and union management organs. This is the insistent demand of the majority of local organizations which the AUCCTU leadership for some reason is not obeying. I consider the proposal regarding this issue made in the report to be a half-baked, prolonged solution to the problem. I support the proposal of Comrade Romanov; namely, to consider it necessary to create a Russian Republic trade union council and to hold an organizational congress of Russian trade unions this year. The Moscow trade union organization thinks that this problem should be solved at this plenum.

We consider it wrong and untimely at this stage to develop discussions about whether the trade union central committee or the trade union council should have priority or about the transfer of the budgets. This will only make people nervous and cause a row in the staff, and it will lead away from the resolution of essential issues and problems. For the actions of the miners were directed not only against departmental pressure; they were an expression of dissatisfaction and a lack of confidence in the local authorities concerning social problems, which should be at the center of the attention of the trade union councils above all. I think it is necessary to abolish not selectively but completely all

existing instructions that restrict the independence of the local organizations. Trade union members are also able to solve their own problems having to do with the structure of their organizations and form their own budget and their own higher trade union organs and staffs.

Independence requires confidence. Therefore we must radically change the existing system of personnel training. We must transform the courses, training-methods centers, institutes for increasing qualifications, and workers' schools and attract highly qualified teachers and equip these training institutes with modern training devices. Our training subdivisions, including the VShPD [higher school of the trade union movement], must work completely on orders from the trade union organs. We should apparently also give consideration to the question of the creation of a school for trade union managers. In general I think that our science is indebted to the country's trade union movement: We keep on our books a large army of scholars but nobody has yet discussed what a trade union is under socialism, nobody has predicted the development of the situation in which we find ourselves today, or proposed a regional model for our actions tomorrow.

We cannot allow more mistakes to be made. We have to pay too high a price for them. Therefore I consider it necessary during the course of the forthcoming report and election campaign to collectively discuss the issue of the role and position of the trade unions in perestroyka and the path to further democratization of relations within the party. The results of this work, in our opinion, should be summed up at an extraordinary congress of USSR trade unions. The Moscow City Council of Trade Unions submitted the corresponding proposal to the AUCCTU 2 months ago. We have not received an answer yet. We do not know whether similar proposals have been made by other trade union councils or trade union central committees. But we think that the objective need to solve many problems makes it necessary to hold a congress.

[Passage omitted] The floor was turned over to the chairman of the Belorussian republic trade union council, V.I. GONCHARIK, for his speech. In a situation of aggravation of both old and new contradictions and social tension in the society, the problem of updating the activity of the trade unions becomes especially important, the speaker emphasized. This is important not only for the trade unions themselves but also for the society as a whole. We have heard repeatedly: Today's trade unions have outlived their time, we need new ones, alternatives (incidentally, they have even appeared in embryonic form). But still I dare say: The majority of workers, including laborers, still, I repeat, still, believe in the capabilities of our trade unions. But these capabilities must be put to work as quickly as possible and to the full extent. And to do this we must first of all give the trade unions independence and autonomy. For the current enlivenment of the activity of the trade unions is not solving the problem. The workers are interested primarily in how reliably the trade union protects and provides for their rights and legitimate interests.

The largest task for us in the republic is solving the problems caused by the Chernobyl tragedy. A good deal has been done, including the help of councils and committees from Russia, the Ukraine, and other republics as well as the AUCCTU. Recently central trade union committees have joined in as well. But far from everything possible has been done, and this gives a negative impression of the situation in the republic. A state program was adopted at a recent session of the republic Supreme Soviet. It includes our suggestions for improving and expanding the material base and giving compensation to residents of regions that have suffered, and we are counting on support from the AUCCTU and the government in order to carry out all these tasks rapidly.

Today a question arises: How are we to overcome the alienation of trade union members from the trade unions and return their faith in them? I think that first of all the trade union committees themselves, before anyone else, must sense the mood of the people, gather up their justifiable demands, and achieve the necessary solutions from the administration and soviet, management, and higher trade union organs. But to do this we must first protect the committees themselves. And this must be reflected in the law we adopt.

In our republic we have come to the point of operationally analyzing the situation for literally each collective, evaluating it, and accelerating the solution to crucial problems. And the analysis of labor conflicts shows that this is possible. The majority of substantiated demands of workers are met during the course of the regulation. This means that we must do more of this work and do it more actively.

Trade union committees are still frequently said to be "in people's pockets," referring to their relations with economic managers. Offensive as this may be, there is some basis for such judgments. But you will agree that we should be speaking about more than just increasing the demands made on managers. Against the background of the weakening of labor discipline and the increase in drunkenness one can clearly see that we are not demanding enough of the observance of trade union regulations and we are not taking advantage of the measures of influence that are envisioned for us. Acceptance which has become all but automatic plus the low level of responsibility—this has devalued our very membership in the trade union. In order to radically update our work we must send competent people and principled leaders to the trade union committees and all of our organs. For today there is no waiting line for the position of chairman of the trade union committee. This means we must support our activists both morally and materially. And we must grant full rights to the local organization: Let it determine for itself whom to pay and how much.

Of course a law on trade union rights is needed. I note with satisfaction that the new draft is much better than the previous one. The fundamental points that must be retained are the right to veto illegal decisions, guarantees for the trade union aktiv, and a legal mechanism for regulating collective labor disputes.

In this connection let me say a couple of words about strikes. Today we can see a tendency toward the development of collective demands which frequently go beyond the framework of individual enterprises, an attempt to exert pressure with the help of warnings about strikes. And we must take this into account as well. Even today the strikes are continuing in the country. I would make this suggestion: Once again appeal to all the labor collectives with a request to introduce a kind of moratorium at least until the end of the year and not to solve all problems through strikes alone. Everyone must understand that unless the economy is stabilized the standard of living will not rise, and then the protection of worker rights will be an illusion for us...

An analysis of the situation shows that on the one hand there is increasing criticism against the trade unions and on the other, their functions and duties are increasing. In this connection I think we should concentrate on solving the major problems, mainly the protective function, and place mainly the local organizations in charge of this work. For strong trade unions mean mainly strong local organizations. But I do not understand when, for example, this idea is blown up: "The trade union councils are increasingly losing the features of a democratic representative organ and being transformed into an administrative superstructure." In this example the councils apparently include the AUCCTU as well since the author of these words is Mikhail Borisovich Ryzhkov, secretary of the AUCCTU.

We will not weigh who has more shortcomings and flaws: the branch or territorial committees. Of course, there are problems in their relationships, and I am by no means inclined to idealize. But I must say positively that this entire campaign, which comes down to separation according to branch or national features, does not help strengthen trade unions. On this basis, even the thought expressed by the chairman of the Central Committee of the Trade Unions of Workers of the Aviation Industry does not seem strange. True, Comrade Albov himself called it "heretical." And specifically: There is no need for USSR Trade Union Regulations. Agreements of the branch trade unions, he says, are sufficient. Let us call things by their names: All of this calls into question the unity of the trade union movement in the country.

We are for another approach—for reasonable, businesslike cooperation in favor of the primary organization. I want to cite a labor dispute in Soligorsk as an example, where the potassium workers submitted a package of demands that was resolved exactly in this way: with the help of the republic council, republic and central committees, and other organs. And it was resolved. This is the kind of new approach that should be used in resolving similar problems. I propose, figuratively speaking, to sit down at the negotiating table on this question. To stop the polemics that are being conducted on the pages of TRUD. Or adopt a proposal that would resound in the report: Instruct the Presidium of the AUCCTU and the commissions to examine this question and develop an acceptable proposal.

Several words about the attitude toward the so-called worker union and other informal organizations. The plenum of the Belorussian Council of Trade Unions expressed its attitude in a resolution which assessed the sociopolitical situation in the republic and the tasks of the trade unions. We are for cooperation with all those who are trying to make a practical contribution to the resolution of socioeconomic, ecological, cultural, and language problems. But we should not be playing to the gallery with them. And this kind of playing is going on. Our plenum, for example, did not support the idea of establishing separate structures that present themselves in opposition to the party, and they are for a single standard-bearer of perestroyka. One cannot help but see the danger in setting workers against each other. But I have a right to ask the question: And where here is the AUCCTU's position of principle? I believe that when such organizations appear on a national scale, we should state our attitude, speaking freely and on the basis of principle.

For some reason recently, the provision of our regulations that trade unions work under the leadership of the Communist Party is being bashfully hushed up. One can hear more and more loudly: The role of trade unions is diminished by the fact that they work under the leadership of the party, and today we hear more and more frequently: "Trade unions are the party's opposition." Is it not in this spirit that article 2 of the draft on independence from political organizations was drawn up? The political organization is ranked with state and economic organizations. Hence, we now hear words in practice about trade unions without communists. We are for the improvement of forms and methods of political influence on trade unions, without petty guardianship and interference in internal trade union life; that is, for a respectful attitude toward trade unions. I very much hope that the CPSU Central Committee and the Council of Ministers will set an example with a business-like reaction to our proposals and to the proposals of the AUCCTU which are formulated today. The very fact of the presence of Comrade V.M. Chebrikov at our plenum warrants such a statement. I especially inquired of the chairman of the Moldavian council, Yeremey, (he has worked in trade unions a long time): When was the last time you saw a secretary of the CPSU Central Committee at a trade union plenum? He said that when Comrade Shibayev was relieved.

I would like to refer to the words of Vladimir Ilich Lenin about the fact that any propaganda on the neutrality of trade unions is either a cover for counterrevolution or a manifestation of complete unconsciousness. These words are 70 years old, but they have meaning even

today. You will agree that when the party is in a complex situation, and when the ideals of socialism are put in question, this must be countered by our persistence, firmness, and unanimity.

V.K. BORODIN is at the rostrum—the chairman of the Central Committee of Trade Unions of the Chemical and Petrochemical Industry. I agree with the speeches I heard here about the fact that the position that the trade unions find themselves in today can justifiably be called a crisis, he said. And we who are in this hall are responsible for finding ways out of the crisis situation and should determine these ways at today's plenum. Personally, I see four main problems.

If the party, after starting perestroyka, critically reinterpreted its activity and took steps to correct errors, then can we today speak about the pressing tasks of trade unions at the current stage of perestroyka, not telling the workers about our errors and theoretical mistakes? Where and why have we lost our fighting and revolutionary spirit in the defense of the interests of the workers? Who is personally responsible for such a situation? What hinders us from quickly restructuring and reorienting our activity? Without this kind of analysis we cannot define the correct direction of the trade union movement and are doomed to shrinking back both in theory and practice.

The chemists' trade union believes that in the decisions of today's plenum we must accurately assess the following situation: the relationships of the trade unions and the state, the trade unions and the party, and the trade unions and economic organs. Ways for correcting committed errors must be outlined, and a determination has to be made on the place and role of trade unions in the political system which is being formed today; trade union policy up to the next regular or special congress must be outlined, and ways for realizing it in practice must be defined. The document must be widely publicized in the press and discussed in primary organizations. We must with practical work prove to the workers that trade unions come to the necessary conclusions from criticism, and that they have a position that fully responds to the interests of the working class. The question concerns the development of a really scientific concept of the restructuring of trade unions that corresponds to the essence of the transformations that are occurring in the country. It must answer the principal question: How to regain trust in the trade unions?

Now about the problem of economic work. Determined pressure in the formation of annual plans continues today. Plans, as a rule, are not balanced. This puts collectives in a difficult position. Programs for the construction of housing and social amenities are not fulfilled.

I want to dwell on the situation that has developed with the chemical workers. Equipment in the branch is 50-70 percent obsolete. Machine construction does not meet the needs of the chemical workers for restructuring actual production. There is not enough building capability for renewal. This evokes the serious and just rebukes of the population on ecology and complaints against the chemical workers that they are polluting the atmosphere, and that they are creating abnormal living conditions. We expended a lot of effort to resolve these problems with the ministries. It did not work out. We turned to the Council of Ministers, to Comrade Ryzhkov. There is no answer. What must we do, dear comrades, repeat the "experience" of the miners? Therefore, we request that Comrades Chebrikov, Voronin, and Razumov, who are here, to help us in resolving these problems. Otherwise the population itself will close down half of the enterprises.

In our opinion, we must switch to such a form of relations of the trade unions and the state as the conclusion of agreements on one or another question that affect the vital interests of the workers. They must clearly denote both the obligations of the state to the workers and the obligations of the workers with respect to the state. In our opinion, wages and work conditions must form the foundation. Today wages are lagging and the living standard of the workers is dropping. Provision must be made for the development of the social sphere and for the possibility of living not an impoverished, but a normal life in retirement. We must also raise the following kinds of questions with the government: When in the final analysis will order be brought to the national economy and in the country to protect workers from thieves, swindlers, profiteers, racketeers, and cooperative prices?

The next problem: the relationship between the soviets of people's deputies, local party organs, and the work collectives of enterprises. I will explain this with a specific example from Leningrad Oblast. The session of the gorispolkom [city soviet executive committee] is arriving at a decision on closing the Kirishskiy plant. It is proposed that this be done in 24 days. But where do you place people in jobs, how do you protect their right to housing, and how do you help those who have lost their health at an enterprise? They made a decision, and further—do what you want. As a matter of fact, 2,000 persons are threatened with being left without work.

There is a similar situation in the city of Tosno. The gorispolkom is approving a decision to withdraw housing above the indicated norms from the labor collective—out of 107 apartments, 45 were left for the enterprise. We submitted a protest to the ispolkom [executive committee]. What do we do now, take Soviet authority to court? I believe it is necessary to define the legal relationships with local executive organs. Further: In a number of republics, the right of workers to jobs, an increase in qualifications, and obtaining appropriate work is dependent on knowledge of the language, period of residence, and so forth. Both the authority of the trade unions and the unity of the trade union movement will depend on how the trade unions are able to ensure the protection of any citizen of the USSR regardless of place of residence. These facts say that trade unions in the

form of a deputy's group must assume responsibility for improving legislation in the country and in the republics in the interests of the workers.

The fourth problem concerns financial self-dependence. It is time to put an end to this discussion. I have been in trade union work for 4 years, and all of this time all I hear is: To whom shall I send the budget? To the Central Committee or the republic committees, or maybe to the soviets. Let us put the question another way: The primary organization is the foundation of the trade union movement. In order that this problem is decided once and for all, we very likely will have to assess the Kuybyshev and Kalinin experiments, and afterwards put the conclusions that were drawn into principles for the formation of regional and interregional branch organs, and even territorial organs. Then everything will be in its place.

There is a lot of talk today: What regulations should we live by? Apparently, there is a need for an agreement on the cooperation of branch trade unions. This problem has come to a head and the matter brooks no delay, but we are trying for the fourth year to put it off to a future time. It seems to me that it is necessary today to establish a commission for the preparation of draft regulations, determine when to hold a special congress, and undertake widespread preparation for their implementation and the realization of those provisions that will be determined at this plenum.

In conclusion—about the Law on the Rights of Trade Unions. We at this plenum virtually "axed" the first version that was published in the newspaper TRUD. The new draft, which is submitted today, is radically different from the previous one, and it deserves approval and the speediest implementation. Our branch trade union is for the creation of independent professional organs in Russia. [passage omitted]

Life itself has raised the question of perestroyka in the trade unions, A.T. POPRAVKA, a locomotive engineer of the "Novosibirsk" locomotive depot of the West Siberian Railroad, noted in his speech. Our collective, where more than 2,100 persons work, has a great desire to work independently. People have begun to get actively interested in production life, in the economics and the that the state presents. In this complicated and responsible period of perestroyka, all opportunities are opening up for trade union organizations to fulfill a basic task—to protect the interests of the workers. However, our trade union organization has nothing to brag about. Today the collective is working under very difficult conditions. Overtime work for individual engineers and assistant engineers for 7 months amounted to 190 hours, while the norm is 120 hours per year. Repair shops break repair technology rules because of a lack of spare parts. The trade union committee does not display firmness in the resolution of questions of betterment of work conditions and safety. Unfortunately the trade union committee does not always have enough purposefulness and perseverance. This kind of a passive attitude is suitable for economic managers for whom the production plan comes first and only afterwards, concern about people. In settling questions that trouble the collective, the trade union committee does not play the role of a leader. All of us understand that this kind of attitude has taken root everywhere over the years. Therefore, we think that in the decisions of the plenum, and in the future in the regulations of trade unions, it is necessary to stipulate that only the trade union committee can represent the collective, setting forth demands associated with the protection of the interests of the workers.

Many different opinions crop up today with respect to the introduction of the Belorussian experiment in railroad transport that is associated with an increase in tariff rates and wage rates owing to the economy of the established wage fund. It simply did not work under the conditions of our enterprise inasmuch as those reserves of freed-up production personnel that the Belorussian colleagues had available to them were used by us much earlier. Now a whole series of workers has been cut, specifically conductors on suburban trains, assistant engineers in traffic switching, workers at technical inspection stations, and others, and this resulted in intentional and unintentional worsening of the technical condition of the locomotives, electric trains, and, in the final analysis, passenger service. And a worsening in the safety of train traffic.

Our workers say a lot about this, and very critically, at meetings, conferences, and sessions, but no one can or wants to resolve the question, and no one listens to the trade union committee. Therefore, we believe it should be recorded clearly that the aforementioned organs, the trade union central committee, and the AUCCTU are obligated to support the requirements and the proposals of the primary trade union organizations and to help them. Many critical remarks and suggestions were made at the plenum of the trade union road committee in summing up the discussions of the draft Law on the Rights of Trade Unions. But the main thing is that any wording of the law will not give the required return given the current USSR trade union regulations. Therefore, the proposal to convene a special congress of USSR trade unions and the adoption of new regulations was approved by a majority vote.

So the trade union committee will be a real defender of the interests of the workers, it is necessary to work with the cadres, to teach by deed those who are newly elected to help fulfill decisions adopted by trade union committees, and not to reduce the "assistance" of higher trade union organs to bureaucratic requirements to draw up one or another document.

Frequently the trade union committee tries to evade questions of work and wages for on this question it is necessary at times to oppose the opinion of the administration. These are the reasons that in many ways explain the leveling approach to wages, the award of bonuses to workers and employees, and the expenditure of financial incentive funds.

The work of a locomotive engineer and also of other railroad workers is associated with a responsibility for the fate of passengers. It is clear that during leave my colleagues need the kind of rest that will enable a person to give himself fully to the job when he returns to work. For this there is a need for rest homes, sanatoriums, and health centers. But is it possible to satisfy the needs of the workers if one voucher is issued for every 50 persons, and this in autumn and winter, and there is no point in even thinking about family rest. And the provision of enterprises with commodities in especially high demand is simply unrealistic. But in our work with its character of travel, it is necessary to resolve such questions as providing workers with food products for this is done at plants and "post office boxes." Neither worker supply departments nor the road committees of the Railroad Transport Workers Trade Union can resolve this question.

The trade union committee must also influence the mood of the people, help them overcome inertia, and involve the workers more widely in managing affairs. We want very much to believe that an increase in the role of trade unions and other social organizations will be promoted by their direct representation in the higher organs of state authority, and that we will stop hearing the phrase that we do not need trade unions.

Comrades, as a locomotive engineer I think that a strike in railroad transport—the main "conveyer" in the shipment of national economy freight—is not permissible. And I assure you that we will not permit this.

G.F. BUDYAK, chairman of the Trade Union Committee of Students at the Moscow Aviation Institute began his speech by saying that for the first time in recent years we chairmen of student trade union committees at VUZ's [higher educational institutions] are taking part in an AUCCTU plenum. In this period, which is very difficult for us and for young students, he said, we hope that it is not a tribute of the times, but the beginning of a well-thought-out system of support for students on the part of the AUCCTU. It is necessary to remark that on the whole students relate positively to the democratization of social and political life and to radical economic reform. But these processes have also evoked a speedy growth in the social and political activity of young students, and they have sharpened the reaction to shortcomings in the economic and social spheres. Students today are not satisfied with the progress of perestroyka in higher and middle special education. About half of those polled feel that its results are insignificant, every fifth student does not see any results at all, and only every tenth student sees positive changes. [passage omitted]

As one of the measures for strengthening the authority of trade unions and students, we proposed the creation of an association of trade union student organizations in higher educational institutions of the USSR. We have already drawn up draft regulations for such an association, and we are ready to submit it to the AUCCTU.

We believe the AUCCTU plenum should state its position with respect to the student situation; we cannot remain silent. This could be a separate statement of the 6th Plenum of the AUCCTU on the situation among the students and the position of the trade unions, or a separate paragraph in the resolution of the plenum on the present situation. I will emphasize once more that the students are one of the most dynamic segments of the society. They will go for that organization which will support their interests. [passage omitted]

D.A. AKKOSHKAROV, foreman of tunnelers at the 50th Anniversary of the October Revolution mine (Karaganda Oblast), began his speech with words to the effect that if I do not express my opinion, shared by my comrades, it will be difficult for me to return. I am ready to share ideas about the organizational arrangement of trade unions, about my own attitude toward the draft law, and about certain other facts. But permit me, comrades, to express bewilderment: There is the question on our agenda of vital and pressing measures, but many of them have come up against theory. I understand your personal concerns. But today to share authority, to clarify before the entire country where to take the budget, to take what from where, and who will be in charge, it seems to me, is superfluous. Someone will argue today, perhaps, and argue tomorrow, but the money is ours, earned by the work collective. We will not permit anyone to spend it without us, and it is better, while time is not lost, for you to come to us and let us discuss it. The threatening July events have shown that the working class is quite reasonable. Is that not so?

I recently met with people who to some degree reproach the miners for their performance. I would like to thank those people from whom I heard that they restrain their friends from such occurrences. I understand them. But let us give credit to miners for setting an example in that they helped the trade unions with their speeches in general and they displayed strength which the trade union criminally did not take advantage of, and let us give credit to the miners. Is this not true? Has it not become better for many of us to rely on the work collective? And let us do everything so the miners and no one else speaks anymore. You see, these tasks could have been resolved—resolved by meeting, exchanging opinions, listening, making concessions, and understanding their concerns.

When I spoke earlier of the right of the "veto" in certain decisions, I never received a response. Why? Is it that we were not psychologically prepared? Who was to blame, and was it not only our own fault for permitting an uncontrollable situation?

Stepan Alekseyevich, when I said the word "veto" the first time, you answered that it is the kind of weapon that should not be brandished like a club. Well, but what shall we do when this club today is brought down on trade union workers and on the trade union as a whole? The present situation of the trade unions reminds me of a bear in a swamp: He is afraid, the ground gives under his

feet, he pulls out his right paw, the weight becomes greater on the other three, and he goes down in the quagmire... Do we not resemble him today? Is not the condition we find ourselves in like this? We have been hearing for 3 years that the wage rates for trade union workers have to be increased, etc., but whatever is said, it is time to decide. We raised so many questions... But you come home—and there is nothing to say.

I will say more. I work deep under the ground, and you, Stepan Alekseyevich, are high above. But what a difference between us! Do we run into the same shortcomings? Am I less concerned, or are you more concerned than we? I also turn to you, the comrades who are here. What is to be done? Obviously we must work. And how is the work arranged? I always thought that the AUCCTU is a coordinating, organizing, dictating, legislative organ, and I thought that the people are engaged in serious work. I wanted to speak earlier about the work of the AUCCTU but I held back. I gained experience, dropped into any office, and met many people... But was what I saw a working organ? I will be so bold as to say what I think. I know, unless you speak sharply no one hears. I may overstep the bounds, but I will speak my mind. The AUCCTU, I mean the apparatus with its commissions, with the secretariat, and the presidium, it does not seem to me that it is efficient, and that it is working. I will provide evidence.

Somewhere commissions are being created, committees are being created, and a lot of other things. The AUCCTU has set up so many commissions! I cannot say that I was happy, but I did not try to get out of it when I was told that I will be the deputy chairman of the commission on social questions. And what did I see during those years? Mass nonattendance. There is nobody to lead. The chairman is not a full-time official—he has his own principal job. You come—fine; you do not—even better. There was this situation: 212 persons assembled, but there was no one to present an agenda and there was no one to conduct the meeting. Is this not a disgraceful incident? Do you really think that nobody knows about this? Why do we not pay attention? And we do not demand that local committees organize a housing and amenities commission, etc.

I have wanted to say for a long time: There is nothing for us to divide, we are together—we have to pull together, and we must develop a collective opinion. I liked Yarin's speech today, and the audience applauded him. He expressed a good idea, that there must be workers in the politburo who will be able to manage normally. I will say once more: The July events reminded me of this. Who had the initiative in the organization in the search for a way out of the situation? The work committee was at the top. I heard today that some people are inclined to say that the workers do not know, how can I put it more mildly, they are not setting the right goals and are not achieving the right things. But look at how they organized themselves, and what great tasks they were able to resolve!

Strike committees were recently established in Karaganda Oblast. Many want them to be abolished, and they are awaiting this moment. It seems to me that the AUCCTU, when it supported the strike committee and when the workers of the apparatus left everything and went there, understood, I think, that the strike committee was as necessary to us as the trade union itself. Time and the election campaign report, very likely, will show the limit of their temporary authority, and then we will decide.

Permit me to talk about one more matter. Today a young man spoke here regarding cooperatives, and he talked about prices. I understand that he cannot buy what is too expensive. Must we endure such a situation?

It seems to me that the Karaganda strike committee set a fine example: After discussions, it decided without any row to shut down such cooperatives. And thank God, as the saying goes.

In conclusion, I would like to say, Stepan Alekseyevich, that I am talking this way not out of a desire to be different, and not out of a desire to say something original. The personal pain that we are all experiencing because of these events compelled me to speak thus. If "my" commission will work that way, I will be forced to cancel my membership in the AUCCTU. I have nothing to say about my work. Permit me to end on this. [passage omitted]

Economic

Report of 1985-88 Budget 'Secrets' Published

18200457 Moscow PRAVITELSTVENNYY VESTNIK in Russian No 18, Sep 89 p 6

[Article by R. Yuryev: "We Reveal Budget Secrets"]

[Text] *Today, we are publishing for the first time a report prepared by the USSR State Committee for Statistics with a complete structure of the State Budget for 1985-88. You will see those "little tricks" which were used for many years to hush up the truth about the true state of finances in our country.*

USSR State Budget (in billions of rubles)

Item	1985	1986	1987	1988
REVENUES (total)	390.6	419.5	435.5	469.0

Including:				
Turnover tax	97.7	91.5	94.4	101.0
Payments by state enterprises and organizations from profit (income)	119.5	129.8	127.4	119.6
of which:				
payment for production fixed capital and fixed working capital	38.1	40.8	41.7	39.5
payment for labor resources	-	-	-	4.9
net surplus profit payments	47.1	38.5	12.8	9.4
fixed payments	5.2	3.2	-	0.7
Profit (income) withholding taxes and other payments	29.1	47.3	72.9	65.1
Income tax from cooperative and public enterprises and organizations	2.5	2.6	2.8	2.8
of which:				
from kolkhozes	1.2	1.2	1.3	1.3
from consumer cooperative enterprises and organizations; from enterprises, public organizations, and cooperatives for producing products and rendering services	1.3	1.4	1.5	1.5*
State loans sold among the population	1.4	1.9	1.9	2.0
State taxes from the population	30.0	31.2	32.5	35.9
Including:				
Income tax	28.3	29.5	30.9	33.9
Agricultural tax	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
Tax on unmarried persons and citizens with small families	1.5	1.5	1.4	1.4
Other types of income tax and payment for patents	-	-	-	0.4
State social insurance funds	25.4	26.5	28.1	30.1
REVENUES FROM FOREIGN ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES (CUSTOMS REVENUES, REVENUES FROM EXPORTS AND NONTRADE OPERATIONS)	71.1	64.4	69.3	62.6
Of the total revenues received:				
From socialist economy	340.3	337.5	343.0	339.9
From the population	32.3	34.1	35.4	39.0
LOAN FUNDS FROM THE STATE LOAN FUND FOR COVERING EXCESS OF EXPENDITURES OVER REVENUES	18.0	47.9	57.1	90.1
EXPENDITURES (total)	386.5	417.1	430.9	459.5
Including:				
For the national economy	209.1	226.3	226.9	242.8
For social and cultural measures	125.6	133.7	140.0	151.3
of which:				
education and science	49.6	52.5	54.8	59.6
public health and physical culture	17.6	18.0	19.4	21.9
social security	31.9	35.0	37.3	39.5
including using state social insurance funds	25.8	28.7	30.8	33.1
state social insurance	22.8	23.6	24.0	25.5
state aid to mothers of large families and single mothers	0.6	0.6	0.7	0.7
funds transferred to the kolkhoz worker social security centralized union fund	3.1	4.0	3.8	4.1
FINANCING OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES (FINANCING OF IMPORT AND EXPORT OPERATIONS, RENDERING UNCOMPENSATED ASSISTANCE, AND EXPENDITURES FOR NONTRADE OPERATIONS)	15.1	18.0	24.6	26.0
FOR MAINTAINING THE ARMY AND NAVY	19.1	19.1	20.2	20.2**
For administration	3.0	3.0	2.9	3.0

**Income tax from cooperatives for producing products and rendering services was 87.9 million rubles.*

***Not counting expenditures for purchasing weapons and equipment for scientific research work, for military construction, for servicemen pensions, and others; in 1989, it is envisioned that 77.3 billion rubles will be spent for these purposes, counting expenditures for maintaining the Army and Navy.*

NOTE: State indebtedness for state bonds held by the population, counting the population's assets in policies of the USSR Main Administration of State Insurance and loan funds of the state loan fund for financing budget expenditures, was more than 312 billion rubles in 1988.

Our Commentary. We can hardly claim now that all the secrets of the state budget have been disclosed, but secrets have been removed. Nevertheless, there is much new and even sensational in this report. The lines given

in all capital letters have never been published before. These include: revenues from foreign economic activities and expenditures for them; expenditures for maintaining the Army and Navy, counting expenditures for purchasing weapons and equipment, for scientific research work, for military construction, for servicemen pensions, and so forth; loans from the state fund covering excess of expenditures over revenues; and, finally, the total domestic state debt.

You see that each of these lines contains quite imposing figures. So, how was it possible to calculate the budget without them? It is all very simple: using the well-known "pot" method, the figures were enlarged so much that individual "trees"—budget items—got lost in the budget "forest." And they got lost in such a way that the revenues always exceeded expenditures. That is why all these years the country's state budget produced a quite satisfactory impression. Expenditures were covered by revenues and, it would seem, there was nothing to worry about. This misled even many experts, including foreigners.

Now, when the cover of secrecy shrouding the budget is removed, we see from the table, for example, what a sharp drop there was in revenues from foreign economic activities compared with 1985, and how sharply expenditures for these activities increased. We also learned the total sum of expenditures for armament, hidden before among many other budget items. Finally, we saw the extraordinarily alarming dynamics of the budget deficit. This is indicated by the last column now being published of the revenue portion of the budget: loans of the state loan fund. The figure was 18 billion rubles in 1985; 47.9 billion in 1986; 57.1 billion in 1987; and 90.1 billion in 1988. Each year we resorted more and more to borrowed funds to cover expenditures. At the same time, indebtedness on state bonds also was increasing.

As a result, by the beginning of this year the domestic state debt reached the huge sum of 312 billion rubles. We also have not been able to hold back the growth of foreign economic debt, which was 34 billion rubles.

The reader will remember that the state budget deficit was publicly announced for the first time in October of last year at a session of the USSR Supreme Soviet: Even with the help of borrowed funds we were unable to cover expenditures. How strange it is that this report did not attract any special attention during the first days: Apparently, this indicated our long-standing indifference to financial matters. Only after a series of articles in the press by experts did the public begin to sound the alarm. And then the true sum of the budget deficit was officially published: not 36.3 billion rubles, as was stated at the session, but 120 billion rubles.

The press has already talked in detail about the program of financial improvement of the country developed by the government, and it hardly makes sense to repeat it. I would just like to remind you that by the end of next year it is envisioned to cut the budget deficit in half—to 60 billion rubles.

Now the USSR Ministry of Finance is finalizing the details of the country's draft state budget for 1990. The USSR Supreme Soviet, its commissions and committees have to review it, make changes, if necessary, and hand down the final decision. We will try to tell our readers in detail about all the phases of this work, once and for all having freed it of all the mysteries and secrets.

Three Free Economic Zones To Be Established

LD2009101389 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0400 GMT 20 Sep 89

[Text] Three free economic zones evidently will be created in the USSR next year. As Ivanov, deputy chairman of the State Foreign Economic Commission of the USSR Council of Ministers, reported at a news conference, the Soviet Government has adopted a fundamental decision on this account. The first zones of joint enterprise will be districts of the cities of Vyborg, Novgorod, and Nakhodka, where a significant portion of the population supported the proposal of the local bodies of power about such a fundamentally new form of development.

Each zone will have a certain specialization. Mastery of new technologies and development of tourism is planned in Vyborg. Thorough processing of raw material and of fishery products will be conducted in the zone of the city of Nakhodka. The specialization of the Novgorod zone is tourism, production of home video equipment, production of video films and of geographical [as heard] images of masterpieces of world art.

Agricultural

More on Nikonov Visit to Vladimir Oblast

PM1909141189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Sep 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Tractor for Lessee"]

[Text] Problems of improving and organizing as quickly as possible the flow line production of modern equipment for family farms and lessees were examined during a 14 September trip to Vladimir Oblast by V.P. Nikonov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

At the "Vladimirskiy Traktornyy Zavod" Association, V.P. Nikonov viewed the enterprise's shops, met with production veterans, and inquired about the production workers' housing and domestic conditions.

V.P. Nikonov paid special attention to the fact that the capacities of almost all the enterprise's main blocks are loaded to the limit. Machine tools that have been in operation for 25-30 years frequently stand idle because

of breakdowns. At the same time, alongside, behind the high fence where the enterprise's defense capacities are located in spacious new shops, there is total silence. The latest machine tools with digital program control do not have a full load and are utilized extremely inefficiently.

Unfortunately, conversion is still taking its first timid steps in the tractor builders' association. Defense capacities recently took on only the production of a small number of components for a new modification of the T-30 tractor. There are no funds or material resources for the modernization of old production. As a result, the excellent modern T-30 tractor and also the feed distributor for family farms and lessees, which has been created on its basis, can still be seen only at exhibitions.

How are the obstacles in the way of the broad development of conversion to be removed? What operational measures are needed to ensure that new machines for the country's national economy are produced in tens of thousands in the next few years? These questions received comprehensive discussion at a meeting of the aktiv of the association's workers and specialists. The possibilities of the full batching of new tractors with a set of trailer implements and equipment and of the development and putting into production of the powerful D-181 air-cooled diesel engine for the new Lipetsk integral tractor were also examined.

On the same day V.P. Nikonov visited the All-Union Scientific Research, Planning, and Technological Institute of Organic Fertilizers and Peat, where he had a discussion with scientists and specialists on problems of making wider and more efficient use of organic fertilizers.

V.P. Nikonov was accompanied on his tour of the oblast by G.F. Kondryukov, first secretary of Vladimir CPSU Oblast Committee.

Agricultural Figures Reported for 15-21 Sep

LD2209051889

[Editorial Report] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic Service in Russian on 15-21 September, unless indicated otherwise. Times of broadcast, given in GMT, are in parenthesis at the end of each item.

15 September

In the Altay the fourth million hectares of grain is being harvested. Each day up to 80,000 tonnes of mainly strong and valuable types of grain are being received by grain processors. (1400)

16 September

The 100,000th tonne of cotton has been laid in Uzbekistan. This is a lot less than last year. The reason is the late ripening of the harvest in the main areas where in spring and the beginning of summer repeated resowing of the cotton had to be undertaken due to the weather. For this reason, in the northern regions where repeat sowing was successfully avoided, harvesting is today progressing at a fast pace. The harvest leaders are the cotton growers of Khorezm. (0800)

17 September

Work in two shifts has begun on the rice harvest in Khorezm Oblast, Uzbekistan. The rice farmers intend to achieve the planned total of 86,000 tonnes of grain rice. (0400)

18 September

The production of foodstuffs in Dagestan has risen by 11 percent and R10 million has been received in above-plan profits in the industry. (2230)

19 September

Harvesting of grain was completed today in Altay Kray. The area harvested covers more than 4 million hectares. Threshing of the grain crop is taking place in the last of the fields. This harvest has not been an easy one, and the hopes of a large harvest have not been justified. More than half of the wheat is being assessed as high-quality by the grain purchases. The harvest is coming to an end. The kray's farms have already created the necessary seed fund reserves, and have now sold over one million tonnes of grain to the state. (0900)

Potatoes and vegetables grown in the Arkhangel Oblast and in the Komi Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic are being shipped in containers by rivermen of the Severodvinsk basin and, in all, crews of the northern river shipping line have to transport around 15,000 tonnes of that cargo. (2100)

20 September

The grain farmers of Tula Oblast have finished plan sales of grain to the state ahead of schedule. Over 440,000 tonnes of grain has been sent to the procurement points. More than half the grain is of a high grade. Grain sales to the state are continuing. (0204)

Two million tonnes of bread grain has been sold to the state by Altay—85 percent of this is valuable and strong wheat. Belorussian farmers have completed the potato harvest on half of the area. (1300)

21 September

Altay grain growers have begun working on account of the third million tonne. Of this, over 1,180,000 tonnes comprise firm, first-class, valuable, and strong wheat. (Moscow Television Service in Russian 0705 GMT)

The state Committee for Statistics has reported that by the beginning of this week 99 percent of land sown with cereals in the country had been harvested. (Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT)

Military

Navy Training Ship Begins Visit to Naples 19 Sep

LD1909225289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1025 GMT 19 Sep 89

[Text] Rome, 19 Sep (TASS)—The USSR navy's training ship "Perekop" arrived in Naples port today on an official visit. The visit is led by Rear Admiral A.S. Kovalchuk, Head of the M.V. Frunze Higher Naval College.

When it came into port an exchange of the nations' salutes was held, and the guard-of-honour was drawn up on the jetty under the flag of the Lower Tyrrhenian Naval District.

The visit is in reply to that paid to Leningrad by the Italian naval training vessel "Amerigo Vespucci" at the end of last year.

Varennikov Addresses Conference on Training

PM2109143389 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 15 Sep 89 Second Edition p 1

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent Colonel V. Streltsov report: "Training"]

[Excerpts] Detailed analysis of what has been achieved and the quest for the most effective methods of training junior commanders were the main subject matter of a training methods conference involving leadership personnel from district training centers at the Leningrad Military District training center base. [Passage omitted].

Army General V. Varennikov, commander in chief of the Ground Forces and USSR deputy defense minister, spoke to the participants in the conference.

Draft Dodger Convicted, Sentenced to Forced Labor

PM2109144789 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 15 Sep 89 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Convicted for Draft Dodging"]

[Text] Kuybyshev—Draftee Petr Zaporotskiy has been sentenced to 2 years forced labor for draft dodging.

Zaporotskiy spent 3 years on the run. He was cunning and covered his tracks. He wrote letters home without a return address to ensure that he was not found via his parents.

After long wandering, the fugitive decided to begin a settled way of life and find regular work. As is well known, you have to get through an enterprise's military registration desk. In the hope that the time of his draft had long since passed, the Armed Forces are being cut back, and everyone would forgive him, Zaporotskiy sent a letter to Kuybyshev asking to be sent the documents whereby he could register at his new place of residence. His arrest and trial then followed.

Certainly, our Army is being cut back. It will need far fewer people and material resources, but that does not mean that military service can be dodged and Soviet legislation violated with impunity.

Victims of Uzbekistsan Helicopter Crash Identified

LD2109184889 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 21 Sep 89

[Text] A TASS correspondent has transmitted data on a helicopter crash near Samarkand.

The helicopter was taking part in an operation to destroy poppy plantations used to make drugs in the Urgut mountains. While about to land, the helicopter was carried away by a strong gust of wind and it hit the rocks. A fire broke out and the helicopter exploded.

Chief of the oblast Internal Affairs Ministry Branch Militia Lieutenant Colonel Radzhabov, militia Major Rabiyev, and the pilots Pryanikov and (Plis) were killed. The helicopter commander Captain Kurdas Hkin was taken to Tashkent in grave condition.

A group of investigators has left for the site of the accident.